

Vol. IV

APRIL-JUNE, 1913

No. 2

RJTA

THE
ROMANIC REVIEW
A QUARTERLY JOURNAL

DEVOTED TO RESEARCH, THE PUBLICATION OF TEXTS AND
DOCUMENTS, CRITICAL DISCUSSIONS, NOTES, NEWS AND
COMMENT, IN THE FIELD OF THE ROMANCE
LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES

Edited by

HENRY ALFRED TODD and RAYMOND WEEKS

with the cooperation of

EDWARD C. ARMSTRONG	LUCIEN FOULET	HENRY R. LANG
MILTON A. BUCHANAN	JOHN L. GERIG	ARTHUR LIVINGSTON
JOHN D. FITZ-GERALD	C. H. GRANDJEAN	KENNETH MCKENZIE
J. D. M. FORD	GEORGE L. HAMILTON	HUGO A. RENNERT
EDWARD S. SHELDON		HUGH A. SMITH

and with the support of

THE HISPANIC SOCIETY OF AMERICA

PUBLISHED BY

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS

LANCASTER, PA.,

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, NEW YORK

Entered as second-class matter April 19, 1910, at the Post Office at Lancaster, Pa., under the Act of
March 3, 1879.

CONTENTS

The Composition of the <i>Chanson de Willame</i> (<i>continued</i>). II. The Reconstruction of the Text Common to <i>Willame</i> and <i>Covenant-Aliscans</i>	HUGH A. SMITH 149
The Sword Bridge of Chrétien de Troyes and its Celtic Original	LAURA HIBBARD 166
Old Spanish <i>fueras</i>	AURELIO M. ESPINOSA 191
Suarez de Figueroa's <i>España Defendida</i> and Tasso's <i>Gerusalemme Liberata</i>	J. P. WICKERSHAM CRAWFORD 207
The Sources of the Symbolical Lay Communion	GEORGE L. HAMILTON 221
Romanic <i>aduolare</i>	EDWIN H. TUTTLE 241
The Record of a Visit to J. C. Scaliger	CAROLINE RUUTZ-REES 243
REVIEWS:	
W. Y. Evans Wentz, <i>The Fairy-Faith in Celtic Countries</i> , by GEORGE H. HAMILTON	253
S. L. Millard Rosenberg, <i>La Española de Florencia (6 Burlas Veras, y Amor Intencionero)</i> . Comedia Famosa de Don Pedro Calderón de la Barca, and <i>Las Burlas Veras</i> . Comedia Famosa de Lope de Vega Carpio, by GEORGE W. BACON	254
Emile Legouis, <i>Défense de la Poésie Française à l'Usage des Lecteurs Anglais</i> by R. W.	256
NOTES AND NEWS	
	260

Articles to Appear Shortly

Old French <i>g</i> and <i>g̃</i> . F. ANDERSON, Reed College.	
The Development of the <i>Mort Arthur</i> Theme in Mediaeval Romance. J. DOUGLAS BRUCE, University of Tennessee.	
The Sources of the <i>Roman de la Violette</i> . DOUGLAS L. BUFFUM, Princeton University.	
A Brief Catalonian Medical Text. JOHN M. BURNAM, University of Cincinnati.	
An Irish Analogue of the Legend of Robert the Devil. RONALD S. CRANE, Northwestern University.	
Notes on the Tragedies of Lupercio Leonardo de Argensola. J. P. WICKERSHAM CRAWFORD, University of Pennsylvania.	
Barthélémy Aneau (<i>continued</i>). JOHN L. GERIG, Columbia University.	
Eustorg de Beaulieu. A Biography. HELEN J. HARVITT.	
A Note on the Ellipsis of <i>y</i> before <i>irai</i> . PHILIP M. HAYDEN, Columbia University.	
Ollanta. E. C. HILLS, Colorado College.	
The Sources of Bartolome Paulau's <i>Farsa Salamanquina</i> . R. E. HOUSE, University of Chicago.	
Old French <i>estovoir</i> . O. M. JOHNSTON, Leland Stanford Jr. University.	
<i>Richeut</i> , Old French Poem of the Twelfth Century, with Introduction, Notes and Glossary. IRVILL C. LECOMPTER, Yale University.	
The Young King, Henry Plantagenet, in Provençal and Italian Literature. OLIN MOORE, University of Illinois.	
The Use of the Plural of Reverence in the Letters of Pope Gregory I. HENRI F. MULLER, Columbia University.	
The Mirror of Knighthood. JOSEPH DE PROTT, Clark University.	
The Harvard Manuscripts of the <i>Roman de la Rose</i> . EDWARD S. SHELDON, Harvard University.	
Notes on Foerster's Edition of <i>Yvain</i> . EDWARD S. SHELDON, Harvard University.	
The Stage Setting of Hell and the Iconography of the Middle Ages. DONALD CLIVE STUART, Princeton University.	
Another Parallel to the First Canto of the <i>Inferno</i> . JOHN S. P. TATLOCK, University of Michigan.	
Romanic <i>*retinas</i> . EDWIN H. TUTTLE.	
The Discussion of the Date of the Birth of Boccaccio. ERNEST H. WILKINS, University of Chicago.	

THE ROMANIC REVIEW

VOL. IV—APRIL-JUNE, 1913—No. 2

THE COMPOSITION OF THE *CHANSON DE WILLAME*

(Continued from page 111)

II

TABLE OF CHAPTERS*

<i>Chanson de Willame</i>	<i>Covenant Vivien and Aliscans</i>
Part I. Lines 1-1106. "Lundi" refrain occurs 19 times, lines 10-1062.	1. <i>Introduction</i> —Tells of William and Vivien and death of latter.— <i>W</i> 1-11.
	2. Derame's invasion. <i>W</i> 12-286.
	3. Viv. refuses to flee on account of vow. <i>W</i> 287-313.
	4. Viv.'s battle with Deramé. <i>W</i> 314-619.
	5. Viv. sends Girart for Wm. <i>W</i> 620-742.
	6. Viv. continues battle. <i>W</i> 743-795.
	7. Viv. wounded and prays for coming of Wm. and for strength to keep vow. <i>W</i> 796-911.
	8. Viv. falls and is left for dead. <i>W</i> 912-927.
	8. Viv. falls and is left for dead. <i>A</i> 354-393.

* This table gives chapter headings only. For explanation see page 86 of Part I and for a reconstruction in detail of the action in those chapters common to both texts see following text.

The references throughout this article are: *La Chancun de Willame*, original edition of the Chiswick Press, 1903; *Covenant Vivien*, edited by Jonckbloet; *Aliscans*, edited by Wienbeck, Hartnacke and Rasch. I have also compared the *Covenant* references with the similar passages in Terracher's edition of *La Chevalerie Vivien*.

9. Girart delivers message. *W* 9. Girart delivers message. *C*
928-1001. 962-1103.
10. Wm. takes army to rescue. 10. Wm. takes army to rescue.
W 1002-1106. *C* 1103-1154, 1192-1229.
[11. Gui refused permission to [11. Guichardet refused per-
accompany Wm. Evidently mission to accom. Wm. *C*
cut out of text here and 1145-1194.]
inserted below. See 17.]

Part 2. 401 12. Battle said to last four 12. Not in *C*.
lines, 1107-1507. days. All but three of
The "Jeudi" re- Wm.'s army killed. *W*
frain occurs 1107-1127.
seven times, 1126-1481. 13. Killing of Girart. *W* 1128- 13. Not in *C*.
1174.
14. Killing of Guischart. *W* 14. Not in *C*.
1175-1223.
15. Wm. carries Guischart's 15. Not in *C*.
body to Orange. *W* 1224-
1301.
16. Guiborc furnishes a second 16. Not in *C*.
army. *W* 1302-1434.
[17. Gui is refused permission [17. See 11 above.]
to accompany Wm. *W*
1435-1531. Properly be-
longs under 11.]
18. Wm takes second army to 18. Not in *C*. See 1st army
Aliscans. under 10.

Part 3. 253 19. Gui follows and overtakes 19. Guichardet follows and
lines, 1508-1760. Wm. *W* 1504-1678. overtakes Wm. *C* 1215-
"Lundi" refrain 20. Wm. fights with pagans. 20. Wm. fights with pagans.
three times, 1584-1760. *W* 1679-1703. *C* 1498-1552, 1568-1627,
1653-1766, 1895-1917; *A*
1-7, 19-56.
21. Saracens bring great forces 21. Sar. bring great forces and
and defeat Wm. *W* 1704- defeat Wm. *C* 1749-1759;
1718. *A* p. 26, ll. 16-18, 418-439.
22. Capture Bertran and other 22. Capt. Ber. and other neph.
nephews of Wm. *W* 1719- Wm. *A* 310-325, p. 26, ll.
1725. 21-30.
23. All others killed except 23. All others killed except
Wm. *W* 1726-8. [Gui also Wm. *A* 481-4.
excepted in last line. An
insertion.]
24. Gui complains of fatigue 24. Not found.
and hunger. *W* 1729-1760.

[Apparently inserted connecting passage. See 25.]

Part 4. 219 25. Gui complains of fatigue 25. Not in *C* or *A*.
lines, 1761-1797. and hunger. *W* 1761-7.
"Mercredi" re- 26. Returns to pagan camp. 26. Not in *C* or *A*.
frain three Eats and drinks much wine.
times, 1779-1978. *W* 1768-1795.
27. Wm. is unhorsed and in 27. Not in *C* or *A*.
great peril. *W* 1796-1818.
28. Gui returns to rescue Wm. 28. Not in *C* or *A*.
W 1819-1856.
29. 20,000 pagans flee before 29. Not in *C* or *A*.
him. *W* 1857-1864.
30. Gui and Wm. kill Deramé 30. Not in *C* or *A*.
and win battle. *W* 1865-
1979.

Part 5. 1574 31. Wm. rides over field alone. 31. Wm. rides over field alone.
lines, 1980-3553. *W* 1980-6. (Gui said to *A* 666-683, 693-4.
"Lundi" refrain follow at distance. In-
nine times, 2090- serted here.)
3550. 32. Wm. finds Viv. dying. *W* 32. Wm. finds Viv. dying. *A*
1987-1999 (Gui not men- 695-705.
tioned).
33. Wm. laments, gives holy 33. Wm. laments, gives holy
bread. Viv. dies (Gui not bread. Viv. dies. *A* 706-
mentioned). *W* 2000-2051. 867.
34. Wm. tries to carry off body. 34. Wm. tries to carry off body.
W 2052-4 (Gui not men- *W* 883-890.
tioned).
35. Sudden attack forces Wm. 35. Sudden attack forces Wm.
to leave Vivien's body. *W* to leave Vivien's body. *A*
2055-2090. [They capture 891-1082.
Gui. An insertion.]
36. Wm. kills Alderufe and 36. Wm. kills Ald. and flees to
flees to Orange. *W* 2091- Orange. *A* 1083-1384.
2212.
37. Scene at gate and in 37. Scene at gate and in
Orange. *W* 2213-2420. Orange. *A* 1571-1911.
38. Wm. goes to Louis for aid. 38. Wm. goes to Louis for aid.
W 2421-2468. *A* 1912-2401.
39. Court scene. Anger with 39. Court scene. Anger with
Blanchefleur. *W* 2469-2634. Blanchf. *A* 2402-2991.
2634.
40. The relief expedition. Re- 40. The relief expedition. Re-
noart branch. Defeat of noart branch. Defeat of
Saracens. Rescue of pris- Saracens. Rescue of pris-
oners. *W* 2635-3553. oners. *A* 3124-8510.

[Among prisoners released are Girart and Guischart but not Gui.]

[Among released are Girart and Guischart.]

A summary of the above table showing more clearly the five divisions of the *Chanson de Willame* is given on p. 86.

RECONSTRUCTION OF TEXT COMMON TO *Willame* AND *Covenant-Aliscans*

I. Introduction. *Willame*, verses 1-11; *Covenant Vivien*, verses 1-51.

The song tells of William who so often fought the pagans and of his nephew Vivien. (It tells how they fought against Deramé at Archamp and how Vivien was killed to the great grief of William and how William took revenge. *W.*)¹

(William dubs Vivien knight and in his honor one hundred companions at Termes. On taking his sword Vivien makes a vow never to flee from the pagans. William expostulates and predicts that this vow will bring his early death. *Cov.*)²

II. Deramé's Invasion. *W* 12-286. *C* 52-357.

[Vivien goes into Spain and makes war against the pagans. *C.*]³
With an army of 10,000 men Vivien is at Archamp.⁴

¹ The statement in parenthesis is, as indicated, taken from the *Willame*. It is not found stated at the opening in the *Covenant*, but is entirely in accordance with the facts of the *Covenant-Aliscans*. Perhaps the reason it is not in the Cov. in its present form is to be found in the breaking up of the *Cov.-Alis.* into two separate poems, resulting in the elimination of unnecessary references in the *Covenant* part to the events of *Aliscans*.

² In *Willame* all this first part of the poem is taken up with the Tedbalt-Estourmi episode which seemingly furnishes the reason for Vivien's refusing to flee. I do not consider this episode original, however. The motive furnished is inferior to the vow. Estourmi and Tedbalt are suspicious personages here. They soon drop out entirely.

Moreover, we do find the vow mentioned in *Willame* as early as v. 292, and many times after, as being the reason for Viv. refusing to flee and the cause of his death. More than once he prays, when near death, for strength to keep his vow (*W*, vv. 807, 900, 908). Finally, for confirmation in the *Willame* of all these facts, see vv. 2000-2022.

³ In *Willame* we are not told how Vivien happened to be at Archamp with Tedbalt and Estourmi. Deramé's attack seems at first directed against Tedbalt and not Vivien. Everything would seem to indicate that the Tedbalt-Estourmi

King Deramé leaves Cordres with 100,000 men and comes here to attack him. Vivien learns of the overwhelming odds against him and is aware of his danger.

III. Vivies refuses to flee on account of his vow. *W* 287-313. *C* 358-439.

Vivien is urged to retire and to send to William for aid. He refuses and says that he had made a vow to God never to flee before the pagans (*W* 292; *C* 400), but he tells his followers that they have his permission to retire (*W* 288; *C* 423) and he will maintain the combat alone. His men all cry out that they will stand by him to the last. He thanks them and puts his trust in God.

IV. Vivien's battle with Deramé. *W* 314-619; *C* 440-832.

Vivien spurs his horse to the attack and with his own hands kills the first pagan (*W* 320; *C* 481). He shouts *monjoie!*, the battle cry of Charles (*W* 327; *C* 490).

Girart comes riding into the press, with his lance he strikes a pagan, drives it completely through him, and hurls him to the ground dead. Then he shouts the battle-cry *monjoie!* (*W* 436-440;⁵ *C* 519-528.)

The battle is most grievous. Vivien encourages his men by word and example. By their prowess they make great execution of the pagans, but numbers are against them, and Vivien sees well that they will be overcome. (*C* 587-595; *W* 449-472.)⁶

incident has been inserted in the *Willame*, thus changing and cutting out much of the first part of the original text. The statement under *II* taken from the *Covenant* also represents, to all appearances, the true situation in the *Willame*. In the *Willame* also Vivien is in Spain and away from William. However, owing to the Tedbalt-Estourmi episode there is nothing in *W* to show how much of the *C* text in this part is original. Vivien's cruel war, his mutilation of prisoners, etc., may be original or may be the work of a *Cov.* reviser. In all probability a great deal of the *Covenant* in its present form is due to revisions.

⁵ In *W* these men are at first said to be Tedbalt's, but Vivien later takes command of them. Although there is much variation in the numerals in both poems, the numbers of the armies given here are the ones generally used in both *C* and *W*. (See *Chevalerie Vivien*, ed. by Terracher.)

⁶ It may be noted that about 100 lines intervene in the *Willame* between the firstfeat of arms of Vivien and of Girart. These lines recount the flight and discomfiture of Tedbalt and Estourmi and, as is the case in general with the Tedbalt episode, they have no parallel in the *Covenant*. In the original, the *coup de main* of Girart likely followed closely that of Vivien.

The short passage in *W* at this point, describing the recognition of Girart, results from the Tedbalt episode. Undoubtedly *W* is here, as is often the case,

Vivien looks through the ranks of his men and sees many of them on the ground dead or wounded. He weeps and regrets the absence of William (*C* 594-607; *W* 473-482).⁷

Vivien's men rally about him, drive back the pagans and there is a lull in the battle (*C* 651-655; *W* 489-494).

The wounds are hastily bound up (*C* 656-667; *W* 517-523).⁸

Vivien encourages his men. He tells them that it is better to fight and die thus in their youth, fighting a good battle, than to live to be old and die in bed. They will be regretted and avenged by posterity. Moreover, their martyrdom will win for them the favor of God. At these words his men again rush to attack the pagans and kill 15,000 of them (*C* 680-693; *W* 500-516; 539-551).⁹

The pagans meet Vivien's attack with overwhelming numbers. His men are but a handful in comparison and are unable to break the Saracen ranks. They ask Vivien what can be done to save them. He urges them to press forward the attack. He has taken a vow before God not to flee and will not break it. If they will trust in God, He may yet save them and send William to their aid. His men cry out: "Has he lost his senses to think to break through these immense forces?" (*C* 694-728; *W* 552-578).¹⁰

much abridged, while on the other hand the text *C* is likely considerably lengthened by later revisions.

⁷ A pagan king, Cordroan, severely wounds Vivien at this point in the *Covenant*. No mention is found in *W* of this incident, but the text of *W* is so clearly abridged that its presence in the original and its omission here is quite likely. Vivien evidently has received wounds in *W*, not recorded in the present text, and such incidents are apt to be described. The point in *W* where I should place this supposed omission is 483-6, a *laisse* of four lines.

⁸ In *C* it is Vivien's wound only that is mentioned as receiving attention, while in *W* the statement applies to the wounded in general.

⁹ If any one should have doubts, up to this point, that *C* and *W* are following the same original, this passage should be convincing. In poems so much changed from the original as these two must be, there will be inevitably many divergences in the facts themselves, in their order, and in numerous details. Such differences are found here but the agreement is too constant, too extensive, and too exact, it seems to me, to permit of any hypothesis except a common original.

¹⁰ At this point and for the next two or three hundred lines the text of *C* has doubtless suffered many alterations through the invention of the Castle episode. It has already been fully treated, so I shall not discuss it here. In *W* at this point there is one line "Et cil sen vont lez le coin dun munt" (v. 569) which is the only suggestion of any place of refuge, if it be such a suggestion.

In the next forty or fifty lines of *W* we find Vivien again telling his mea

V. Vivien sends Girart for William. *W* 620-742; *C* 833-961.

With the number of his men much reduced and their case hopeless Vivien sends Girart for aid to William (*C* 833-847; *W* 622-633).¹¹

With great effort and much fighting Girart finally breaks through the ranks of the enemy, escapes them and goes for William (*C* 940-951; *W* 695-701).¹²

Girart makes the difficult journey¹³ and reaches William's city.¹⁴ (*C* 952-961; *W* 702-740.)

VI. Vivien continues the battle. *W* 743-795; *C* 1328-1412; *A* 222-230.

After the departure of Girart for aid, Vivien with his remaining men had maintained a desperate but losing battle with the pagans. Vivien with his own hands has killed a thousand (*C* 798;

that his vow prevents him fleeing, but he gives them leave to do so. They all leave him except Girart, but turn back at the sight of so many pagans barring their way (vv. 594-619). This may or may not be in the original. Is the dream of William (*C* 1019), where he sees Vivien's men desert, a possible reference to this?

¹¹ Immediately following in *W* is a considerable passage in which Vivien tells Girart to remind William of the various battles where Vivien had aided his uncle. This has no corresponding passage in *C*, and there is no way to tell if it was in the original.

¹² In the next forty or fifty lines of *W* we have an effective passage where Girart, his horse dead, continues the journey on foot, throwing away his armor piece by piece because it would not aid Vivien in Archamp. We do not have a corresponding passage in *C* and are unable to say if it is original.

¹³ Here for the first time we find an important difference between *C* and *W* in the sequence of events. *C* continues the narrative of Girart's trip for aid, his arrival, and William's relief expedition, reserving the account of Vivien's last combat and fall until William has reached the battlefield. On the other hand, *W*, once Girart has broken through the ranks and started for aid, returns to Vivien and relates his final struggle and fall, and then takes up again Girart's journey and the return of the relief expedition. As will be recognized, either procedure is logical. The two actions are going on at the same time. It is impossible to tell which is the original order, and the matter, moreover, is not important, since it is simply a question of transposition in one or the other text. I have followed the order in *W*.

¹⁴ In *C* this city is Orange. In *W* in this passage (occurring twice) the city is Barcelonia. The subject has been well discussed and I refrain. I should say, however, that in all other passages in *W* (none other occurring before v. 2054) this city is called Orange. As an expression of opinion I should willingly agree that this city is in the original in Spain, explaining Orange as a later change made everywhere in *C* and in all passages except this in *W*.

W 745). He encourages his men to fight in awaiting the arrival of William (*W* 742-753; *C* 1328-1337). The Saracens respond to the attack in overwhelming numbers and surround Vivien on all sides, placing him in most grievous peril¹⁵ (*W* 754-5; *C* 1344-5; 1357-1364).

His great personal prowess alone maintains him. His lance beats down all who approach. In despair of overcoming him the pagans attack his horse, pierce its body with lances and darts and bring it to the ground. (*C* 1365-7, 1384-1390; *W* 760-771.)

With his horse dead the Saracens press the attack fiercely. He gets on his feet and defends himself desperately, but is terribly wounded by darts and almost killed. (*W* 772-780; *C* 1391-1400.)¹⁶

With his own hand he kills the pagan warrior who had most severely wounded him (*W* 783-793; *Aliscans*, 222-230).¹⁷

VII. Vivien wounded prays for coming of William and for strength to keep vow. *W* 796-911; *C* 1413-1441; 1452-1477; 1553-1567; 1628-1651; 1767-1894; *A* 89-94; 9-10; 61-68; 323-342.

Vivien fighting desperately realizes death is near. He prays God to send him first William and he will be content. He repents that he should have wished to save his own life. In anguish he beseeches God and the saints to pardon him his sins, to let him keep

¹⁵ At this point *W* states that all Vivien's men are killed, while *C* brings to his aid in the next incident a small remnant of his army. With the tendency of *W* to abridge and cite only personal exploits and with *C*, on the contrary, drawing out the contest to improbable lengths, either or both may have departed from the original in this case. In any event, the question is of no great importance. The significant incidents of the struggle in both texts are to be found henceforth in Vivien's last fight personally, his desperate bravery, and final fall.

¹⁶ One of several passages indicating that the castle incident of the *Covenant* is a late addition is found in lines 1415-9. Although Vivien is supposed to have led his men out of the castle only when he hears William coming, he speaks here as if in utter ignorance of the success of Girart's mission.

¹⁷ It will be noted that I support this last statement in *W* by a reference from *Aliscans* instead of the *Covenant*. A close examination will show clearly, I think, that, beginning in the vicinity of this passage, the *Aliscans* and *Covenant* overlap often. In some places we have lines and passages literally agreeing. A few examples are: (*C* 1649-1651, *A* 233-6, *C* 1716, *A* 21, *C* 1717-8, *A* 30-1, *C* 1719, *A* 22, *C* 1733, *A* 24). It is probable that agreements of *C* and *A* indicate passages of the original, but in general I have preferred here to admit only those found in one or both of these texts that are also supported by *W*.

until death his vow not to flee a foot from the pagans.¹⁸ (W 793-825; A 89-94, 323-342; C 1559-1567.)

In the agony caused by his wounds and his exertions, Vivien's sight is troubled, his mind wanders at times, and he fights blindly. They cut off his armor piece by piece so that it hangs in shreds. His entrails issue from his body and he sustains them with his hands. His good sword clogged with blood and carnage remains cramped in his right hand. He still prays to God to allow him to see William before his death and to keep his vow. (W 825-911; C 1768-1784; A 9-10, 61-68, 328-342.)

VIII. Vivien falls and is left for dead. W 912-927; A 354-393.

At last there comes riding a terrible warrior who hurls a lance at him and brings him finally to earth. They leave him lying beneath a tree by a small stream and turn to meet William, who is pressing forward to the attack¹⁹ (W 912-927; A 354-391).

IX. Girart delivers the message. W 928-1001; C 962-1103.

When Girart arrived William had just returned from *Burdele sur Girunde* where he had fought long battles and lost many men. (W 933-5; C 1120-3, 838-9).²⁰ Guiborc is with him (C 1033-7; W 939). William looks out, see Girart coming toward him, recognizes from his attire and bloody sword that it is someone who has been in a great battle, and predicts that they will have news (C 1001-1014; W 940-951). He recognizes Girart and asks him for his message (C 1045, 1051-2; W 956-8).

¹⁸ In W we do not have, as in *Aliscans*, a passage in which Vivien breaks his vow or rather is on the point of doing so. However, the lines cited above and others of the same nature show most clearly the importance of this motive. They indicate possibly that there was such a scene in the original. If this were not the case we see at least that the fear of breaking this vow is Vivien's obsession as death approaches, and from this to the scene recounted in *Aliscans* the step is a very short one.

¹⁹ The stream is not mentioned at this point in W, but we find it verse 1988. Perhaps it may be claimed that I have taken too much for granted in W by saying that the Saracens turn to meet William who is approaching. That would seem to me, however, to be the only reasonable explanation for their not carrying away Vivien's body. Also we find Vivien still living after William has been defeated and arrives where his nephew lay. He must have been near at hand then.

²⁰ Possibly I may be criticised for putting this statement as coming from both C and W. It seems to me that it is justified from the passages I have given in C and others not cited. If, however, the evidence seems insufficient, I should willingly concede it.

Girart relates that he brings heavy news. King Deramé has come with his forces to attack them at Archamp²¹ and has done grievous damage (*C* 1053-1070; *W* 959-969).

Vivien had refused to flee and now sends for William to aid him in his great peril (*C* 1071-2, 1097; *W* 970-1001).²²

X. William takes army to the rescue. *W* 1002-1106, 1343-1398; *C* 1103-1154, 1192-1229.

On hearing Girart's message William was much grieved. He said: "I have fought so much against the enemy that I have lost most of my men." He does not see how he can assemble such a large army from so great distances and equip so many soldiers. Then Guiborc comforts him.²³ Through her efforts and resources an army is assembled and equipped. William ceases to mourn and is greatly rejoiced at this unexpected aid. (*C* 1115-1154; *W* 1006-1020, 1343-1398).²⁴ The army is quickly ready and is encouraged to fight for revenge.²⁵

²¹ At this point (v. 962) the scene of battle is mentioned in *W* as being in France. It seems certain that localities are much confused in all parts of this poem as well as in the others.

²² We have at this point in *W* Girart recounting the service of Vivien for William, mentioned by Vivien when he starts Girart on his mission. Again this passage does not appear in *C*, but by omitting it here I do not mean, of course, that it may not have been in the original.

²³ I should omit from the text the brief mention made here of Guischart for reasons elsewhere stated. I consider it inserted here to fit in with the Guischart episode of the "Jeudi al Vespre" portion of the *Willame*.

²⁴ It will be noted that I support a part of the above passage by referring in *W* to a number of lines in the second expedition. In other words I should combine the accounts of the first and second expeditions to secure a complete parallel to the corresponding passage in the *Covenant*. I think this can be justified. The most hasty examination of the passages recounting the preparation and starting of these two expeditions will show that the greater part of the text is literally the same in each. The one is a copy of the other and it is consequently entirely proper to take both of them in order to secure the complete text, because of the numerous alterations and omissions that have undoubtedly been made in both passages.

²⁵ The next 400 lines in *W* have the refrain "Jeudi al vespre" and the events related in these 400 lines are not found in the *Covenant-Aliscans*. To make this situation clear see the table of chapter headings. Chapters 12-18 in *W* belong to this "Jeudi" portion. These chapters relate how the battle is supposed to last four days and all but three of William's army are killed (*W* 1107-1127), the killing of Girart (*W* 1128-1174), the killing of Guischart (*W* 1175-1223), how William carries Guischart's body to Orange (*W* 1224-1301), how Guibore furnishes a second army (*W* 1302-1434) and William's second expedition to Archamp.

XI. Gui (Guichardet) is refused permission to accompany William. *W* 1435-1531, 1040-1060; *C* 1145-1210.

Guiborc serves the knights with supper.²⁶ After the meal there comes before William a nephew, Gui, a brother of Vivien, only fifteen years of age.²⁷ He asks William to give him arms that he may go to the aid of his brother. (*C* 1145-1194; *W* 1040-1060, 1432-1449, 1513-1516, 1529-1531.)

To Gui's request William replies: "You are too much a child and of too young an age. (*C* 1166; *W* 1525.) You will not be able to endure the sight of the battle, the hunger and hardship."²⁸ In spite of Gui's entreaties, he refuses permission to go and entrusts Gui to the care of Guiborc. (*C* 1165-1181; *W* 1450-1453, 1480, 1524-1531.) After the repast the knights sleep, and the next day they are called to arms to start on the expedition. William mounts and rides at the head of his host. Guiborc comes to his horse's side, encourages him, commends him to God's keeping, and kisses him with much emotion. (*C* 1192-1210; *W* 1064-1081, 1483-1503).²⁹

XIX. Gui follows and overtakes William. *W* 1504-1678; *C* 1215-1327.

William rides out of his good city at the head of an army of twenty or thirty thousand men³⁰ (*C* 1215-1220; *W* 1504-1505).

²⁶ The passage in *W* where Girart is served at supper by Guiborc in the first expedition and the same passage with William instead of Girart in the second expedition are not related in the same way in *C*. However we do clearly have a supper scene in this latter text also.

²⁷ This incident about Guy has been, I assume, cut out of the *laisse* in *W* beginning 1040. In any case this same *laisse* is repeated as a part of the second expedition, beginning verse 1400, and there we find the incident very much as it is in *C*. I presume, of course, that no one will question that Gui of *W* and Guichardet of *C* are the same person. As I have already pointed out, it is necessary often to take both the passages of the first and of the second expeditions, in *laisses* that are identical or nearly so, in order to secure the complete text. This is what I have done here.

²⁸ It will be noted that in *W* a part of this speech is put in the mouth of Guiborc instead of William. However, it would seem that she is only repeating the earlier words of William, to whom the speech is more natural.

²⁹ One will note again at this point that it is necessary to take the corresponding passages in both expeditions in order to secure a more complete text. For example, line 1502 is unintelligible because of omissions preceding it. 1080, in the first expedition, makes it immediately clear.

³⁰ *C* has 20,000; *W* has 30,000. The difference in numerals is not surprising and often more striking ones occur in the same text.

Gui is left alone with Guiborc. On seeing the army leave he begins to weep and implores Guiborc to allow him to follow. She at first refuses, alleging the authority of William who had left him in her keeping. Finally, however, he secures her permission. (*C* 1230-1269; *W* 1506-1539.) Then Guiborc arms Gui as a knight. They put on his helmet and gird on a sword. When he is armed he takes his leave and gallops after the army.³¹ (*C* 1270-1277; *W* 1540-1567.)

When Gui comes in sight of the army they are drawing near the battle-field at Archamp. William sees Gui approaching and asks who this strange knight is. "Do you not recognize your nephew Gui, whom Guiborc has armed knight," is the reply. William is touched by this and takes Gui with him to the approaching battle. (*C* 1306-1327; *W* 1562-1677).³²

XX. William fights with pagans. *W* 1094-1119,³³ 1679-1703, *C* 1498-1552, 1568-1627, 1653-1766, 1895-1917; *A* 1-7, 19-56.

When William arrives at Aliscans he sends forward half his army as a first division to attack the pagans, who were encamped along the sea shore. (*W* 1094-1101; *C* 1478-1484, 1498-1504).³⁴

³¹ Owing to the fact that it is the tendency of *W* to abridge, while *C* is clearly very often a revised and expanded text, it is sometimes difficult to judge whether a passage has been omitted in *W* or added in *C*. However, there would not seem to be much doubt that Gui's banal adventure with the robbers, recounted in *C* 1278-1302, is an example of the latter procedure.

³² The considerable passage in *W* at this point, in which William encourages his men for the approaching battle, I should willingly consider original. Possibly one might see a reflection of this in *C* in such lines as 1226-8 and 1322-7, but as elsewhere, when I have not been sure that a passage is found in both texts, I refrain from including it.

³³ For this battle of William in *W* one must take similar passages in both expeditions: vv. 1088-1125, and vv. 1670-1727. They are largely identical, but each has events omitted in the other. Both are brief résumés only, it evidently being the compiler's intention to give merely the results here and to devote himself to the personal exploits of William and a few other heroes. This peculiarity of the *Willame* is discussed more at length elsewhere, so I mention it only at this point.

³⁴ This separation of the army into divisions with William in command of the rear corps is, it seems to me, clear in all three texts: *Willame*, *Covenant*, and *Aliscans*. In addition to the passages cited from the first two, if one will read the first few hundred lines of *Aliscans*, he will see that Bertran and the other knights are first mentioned as being in the thick of the fight and only after their defeat and capture is the interest concentrated on William's combats.

The pagans surprised by this attack are unarmed. They flee to their tents and ships and arm themselves hastily to meet this attack. (*W* 1102-1106, 1694-1702; *C* 1516-1523, 1529-1545, 1552-3.)

When the great pagan host is armed they sally forth with overwhelming forces against the attack of William's army. (*W* 1107-1119, 1702-3; *C* 1571-1590.)

XXI. Saracens bring up great forces and defeat William. *W* 1704-1718; *C* 1749-1759; *A* p. 26, verses 16-18, 418-439.

Then William appears at the head of his division and with the terror of his name and his great prowess is winning the battle, when the reserve of the enemy, all the great pagan leaders, fall upon him and he is hemmed in by 15,000 of the enemy. *W* 1704-1715; *C* 1668-1679, 1714-1740, 1749-1759; *A* 19-56, page 26, 16-18, 418-439.)

XXII. They capture Bertran and other nephews of William. *W* 1719-1725; *A* 310-325; p 26, 1-21, 30.

Now it fares ill with the French.

The terrible pagan warriors strike down and kill or take prisoner William's men. There are captured Bertran and other nephews and knights of William. These are bound and taken to the ships.³⁵

XXIII. All others are killed except William. *W* 1726-8; *A* 481-4. Of his entire army William is the only one left.³⁶

³⁵ There is no thought of entering into a discussion of this passage which has, I believe, already been exploited far more than its importance warrants. A few points, however, may be noted. The names mentioned here in *W* are: Bertran, Guelin, Guischart, Galter and Reiner. Verses 2343-2373 mention again the five captives with the name Guiotun taking the place of Guischart. Verses 2483-5, and 3049-3055 have the list as first given, while verses 3152-4 replace Reiner by Girart. Girart is also mentioned, verse 3455.

These changes are, I should say, inevitable in poems so much altered and revised. We see the same thing in the *Aliscans*. That the list in *W* should not agree perfectly with that of any MS of *Aliscans*, then, is not surprising. It would be exceedingly surprising if it should. Some names are, however, the same in all and no one will contest, I presume, that they come in all the versions from a common original.

What is more important to note here is that two knights are captured who are mentioned earlier in the "Jeudi al vespre" part as being killed, i. e.: Guischart and Girart. It is only one of the many passages showing the lack of agreement of that portion of the *Willame* with the "Lundi al vespre" poem.

³⁶ In *W* Gui is also excepted. This exception of Gui seems to me clearly

XXXI. William rides over field alone.³⁷ *W* 1980-6; *A* 666-683, 693-4.

The Count William rides over the field. (*W* 1980; *A* 693 variant.)

He is grieved and full of sorrow. (*W* 1981; *A* 694.)

The lances of his helmet are broken and it hangs towards the ground. (*W* 1982-3; *A* 669-670, 694, variants 1 and 2.)

He is stained with blood (*W* 1894; *A* 677*).

XXXII. William finds Vivien dying. *W* 1987-1999; *A* 695-705, 724-7.

He sees Vivien lying beside a pool
At a spring of running water,
Beneath a leafy shade tree (*W* 1897-9; *A* 695-7).

Vivien's hands are crossed on his breast.
Sweeter did he smell than spice or balm.

In his body were fifteen wounds. Of the least of them would have died an emir. (*W* 1990-3; *A* 724-7.)

XXXIII. William laments, gives holy bread, Vivien dies. *W* 1995-2051; *A* 706-867.

William regrets Vivien's rashness and mourns for the loss of a relative, the like of whose prowess he will never see again. (*W* 1995-9; *A* 728-742.)

"Nephew Vivien," cries William, "When I knighted you in my palace at Termes,—For your love I gave a hundred helmets,—A hundred swords and a hundred new shields—Now you are dead —Your body pierced through and through. May God have mercy

an inserted passage, put in at this point to join the "Lundi" poem with the "Mercredi" portion, which is an episode devoted to the adventures of Gui. The following lines in *W*, 1729-1760, which are still in the "Lundi" poem, are a further introduction to the Gui episode and I should consider them interpolated into the "Lundi" text for that purpose. These transitional passages are the only ones of importance in the "Lundi" text which do not have a parallel in the *Covenant-Aliscans*, excepting the Tedbalt-Estourmi episode.

The next chapters 24-30 belong to the "Mercredi" text and are not found in the *Covenant-Aliscans*. They relate the marvellous exploits of Gui and how he and William kill Deramé. See table of chapter headings.

³⁷ In *W*, verse 1986, Gui is said to accompany him. The line is most evidently inserted, for Gui is certainly not present in the fine scenes just following found substantially the same in both *A* and *W*. That Gui should be present at this death scene of his brother, Vivien, and not be mentioned in any way is unbelievable.

on you and on these others who lie dead with you!" (*W* 2000-2009; *A* 767-770, 784-792.)

William repeats his lamentation over Vivien's body. It was Vivien's rash vow, not to flee from the pagans, he is sure, that has brought about his death. He beseeches him to speak and if possible to taste the holy bread he carries in his knap-sack, which will absolve him from his sins. At this appeal Vivien opens his eyes, recognizes William, confesses his faults, and receives from William's hands his last absolution. When he has taken the holy bread his soul departs to paradise. (*W* 2010-2051; *A* 792*-867.)

XXXIV. William tries to carry off body. *W* 2052-4; *A* 883-890.

William raises the body of Vivien and places it on his horse in front of him in an endeavor to carry it back to Orange.

XXXV. Sudden attack forces William to leave Vivien's body. *W* 2055-2090; *A* 891-1082.

Suddenly he is attacked by fifteen kings headed by Matamars and is forced to leave behind Vivien's body.³⁸ He then attacks these pagans with such fierceness that he kills or puts them all to flight. (*W* 2052-2090; *A* 888-1079.)

XXXVI. William kills Alderufe and flees to Orange. *W* 2091-2212; *A* 1083-1384.

Escaping the danger from the fifteen kings, William is next attacked by the mighty Aerofle (*W* Alderufe). With words of scorn for each other's religion they come together with a mighty shock by which both are overthrown. After a terrible combat William cuts off the leg of his giant antagonist and seizes the splendid horse of his enemy to replace his own which was exhausted. When Aerofle blames him for taking away his matchless steed William turns back and cuts off the head of the fallen pagan. Then disguised as a Saracen he again starts for Orange.³⁹ (*W* 2095-2208; *A* 1085-1379.)

³⁸ At this point in *W* we have a few lines relating to the capture of Gui, which have every appearance of being inserted. It is strange, for example, that Gui should be supposed to be with William all this time, yet in no way to take part in the death scene of his brother Vivien. Moreover, though Gui is now captured he is not among those released, but drops out of the poem henceforth. It seems to me evident that this passage reciting the capture of Gui at this point is due to the reviser who has inserted the "Lores fu Mercredi" part in the *Willame*. It is a connecting passage.

XXXVII. Scene at gate and in Orange. *W* 2213-2420; *A* 1571-1911.

Pursued by the pagan army, William at last arrives before the gates of Orange.⁴⁰ The porter does not recognize him in Saracen armor and calls Guiborc. She refuses to believe that William would return as a fugitive and denies him admittance, until he has proven who he is by rescuing single-handed some Christian prisoners from a large Saracen army before the walls, and unfastened his helmet, so that she can see his features. When he has complied she finally permits him to enter.⁴¹ (*W* 2209-2327; *A* 1549-1767.)

Guiborc receives William and disarms him. Then she asks him what he has done with his army. He tells her how Vivien has been killed, Bertran and the other heroes captured and all his men lost. When she learns of these captured counts she urges him to go at once and seek aid from the Emperor. She and her women will defend the city during his absence. William yields to her counsels and just before dawn sets out on this mission.⁴²

XXXVIII. William goes to Louis for aid. *W* 2421-2468; *A* 1912-2401.

⁴⁰ The differences in the account given of this combat by the two texts are not material. In *A* we have Aerofle accompanied by Danebur whose role is brief. Also in *A* William puts on armor of Aerofle to complete his disguise. *W* does not specifically state that he puts on this armor, but later he is mentioned as being armed as a pagan and is mistaken for Aerofle. There is also a slight difference in the order in which the events are related.

⁴¹ *A* recounts several incidents of this chase, particularly William's encounter with Baudus (*A* 1380-1548). These incidents are not mentioned in *W* and are not of sufficient merit to warrant one in considering them original. It is quite likely that this is one of the many additions that have evidently been made to the original text by the *Aliiscans* reviser.

⁴² The main incidents of this famous scene are the same in both texts. The chief difference is that it is, as usual, briefer in *W* than in *A*. While this constant difference is, no doubt, sometimes due to the abridgment of *W* as much as to the additions in *A*, in this and a few other fine scenes this abridgment of *W* is less apparent, and I should regard most of the difference due to the expansion of the *A* text.

⁴³ Again perhaps the differences between *W* and *A* in this passage do not require much comment. *W* mentions once again Gui, although possibly the name is found in another form elsewhere, and also devotes some space to the supper of William and Guiborc. This supper scene may be original. William must have taken supper in *A* also, for the time of his arrival and leaving seem to be the same in both.

William makes the journey to Louis' court sadly and arrives with broken armor.⁴³

XXXIX. Court scene. Anger with Blanchefleur. *W* 2469-2634; *A* 2402-3133.

When the courtiers learn of his disaster they receive him coldly. He tells the Emperor of his misfortune and asks for aid, but Louis at first turns a deaf ear, and is encouraged in this by the Queen, Blanchefleur, William's sister. In fury William most bitterly inveighs against her and threatens her life. He is restrained by the members of his family who promise him aid and force the King to give William his army to free Orange.⁴⁴ (*W* 2454-2634; *A* 2044-3133.)

XL. The Relief Expedition. Renoart Branch. *W* 2635-3553; *A* 3124-8510.

On leaving the court of Louis William takes with him a giant pagan captive, named Renoart, found in Louis' kitchen. After a number of burlesque exploits on the part of Renoart, who carries a great club, and is continually getting into trouble, they arrive at Orange, with a large army including William's relatives. Guiborc learns that Renoart is her brother and has him knighted.

William now leads his army to Archamp and in a great battle, of many incidents, in which Renoart plays the chief role, finally overcomes the pagans, takes revenge for his former defeat, and rescues the prisoners.⁴⁵

HUGH A. SMITH.

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN.

A has a considerable passage devoted to the adieu of William and Guibore, the latter's fears and William's vow not to forget her. This is not in *W*.

The list of captured heroes is, perhaps, taking the inevitable differences of these texts, more remarkable for the number of names that agree than for the differences.

⁴³ The detailed adventures of William on the way to the court may well be elaborations of the *A* version.

⁴⁴ This account is much longer in *A* than in *W* and in all probability many of these incidents in *A* are due to elaborations of the original. The most important of these incidents of *A*, not found in *W*, are William's adventures on his way to the court, and the role played by his niece Aelis.

⁴⁵ For our purpose it is useless to go into the many details of the Renoart branch or to point out the many incidents that may differ in the two versions. In general almost all of *W* is found in *A*, which has further many details, some of which may perhaps belong to the original version, but most of which are evidently later elaborations. As a rule the important incidents are found in both.

THE SWORD BRIDGE OF CHRÉTIEN DE TROYES AND ITS CELTIC ORIGINAL

Outline: Chrétien's sword bridge—Paris's identification of it with the soul bridge of Oriental and Christian legend—The soul bridge in the Irish visions—The history of the idea in western ecclesiastical legend—The evidence of the *Walewein* which identifies the soul and the sword bridge—Explained by the general character of “ecclesiastical romance” subsequent to Chrétien—Other possibilities of origin of the sword bridge—Perilous Passage of pagan Celtic story—Final explanation—Crossing the sword bridge originally one of the champion-feats celebrated in heroic Irish legend.

THE origin of the perilous bridge in mediaeval allegory and romance has commonly been traced to the concept of the soul bridge leading to the Kingdom of the Dead, an Eastern idea that had found its way into Christian legend before the time of Mohammed,¹ or to the Perilous Passage of pagan Celtic story, a *motif* which some scholars have thought to be, so far as the bridge is concerned, simply a specialized form of the first. The purpose of this paper is to define more closely the significance of these two concepts, and to consider their connection with the sword bridge in Chrétien's *Conte de la Charette*, one of the earliest instances, if not the earliest, in which the perilous bridge appears in purely romantic literature. The result of this comparison seems to indicate that the soul bridge offers but a very doubtful antecedent to the sword bridge. If the Perilous Passage be differentiated from the soul bridge, it comes nearer to a satisfactory explanation of Chrétien's invention, but even so it leaves unexplained the form and the function of the sword bridge. It is believed that another explanation can be offered which not only accounts for the peculiar nature

¹H. L. Ward, *Catalogue of Romances*, Lond., 1893, II, 399. The following terms are here synonymous: Soul bridge, Bridge of the Dead, Bridge of Judgment, of Purgatory.

of the bridge but confirms in an unexpected way the theory of the Celtic origin of the story as a whole.

Chrétien's account of the sword bridge is found in an episode peculiarly detailed and picturesque. He tell us that the realm of Méléaguant, the land "dont nul ne retourne," is defended by two bridges. When Gawain and Lancelot on their errand of rescuing Queen Guinevere from her captor, Méléaguant, come to the bridges, Gawain takes the first, the *pont evage*,² which has as much water above as below it; Lancelot takes the second and more terrifying one:

"Li autres ponz est plus malvès
Et est plus perilleus asez,
N'ainz par homme ne fu pasez,
Qu'il est comme espée trenchanz;
Et por ce trestotes les genz
L'apelent le pont de l'espée."

v. 668

In another passage, after describing the terrible river which ran beneath the bridge, Chrétien goes on to say:

³ This bridge seems directly reminiscent of the concept of an Otherworld lying underneath water. Although such a concept is not exclusively Celtic, one of the frequent episodes of old Irish story is that of a hero going by way of an under-water passage to a Land of Marvel. Loegaire, having dived through a loch, reaches the Kingdom of Fiacha of the Fairy Folk, *Loegaire mac Crimthan*, Book of Leinster, summarized by A. C. L. Brown, *Harvard Studies in Phil. and Lit.*, 1903, VIII, 40-1; cf. 76: the home of Terror, the head-cutting champion, is beneath the water, *Fled Bricrend*, ed. G. Henderson, Irish Texts, 1889, 99: Diarmid falls through a well to find an Elysian land beneath, *Gilla Decair*, *Silva Gadelica* I, 258-276; tr. II, 55, 292: Murough, in his quest for the ferule, dives through a lake into *Tir na n-og*, *Giolla an Fhiuigha*, Lad of the Ferule, ed. D. Hyde, Irish Texts, 1899: Brian, one of the sons of Turenn, puts on his water dress, and leaps into the sea. After a fortnight he comes to the sunken island belonging to the Women of Fencara, Joyce, *Old Celtic Romances*, 87.

The sword bridge and the one beneath the water are so closely connected, it seems probable they are derived from the same kind of material. If the whole episode of Guinevere's abduction be Celtic in character (see here, n. 35), and the evidence just cited be taken as establishing the fact that a perilous under-water passage was a familiar means of approach to the fairy Otherworld, there seems some reason for accepting the *pont evage* as a simple enough development from the old Irish legends. Foerster, *Der Karrenritter*, Halle, 1889, p. LXIX, refuses to see in it more than "doblette" of the sword bridge. Foerster, p. LXXI, and Gaston Paris, *Romania*, XII, 530 ff., comment on the use of the under-water-bridge by Chrétien and André le Chapelain.

"Et li ponz qui est en travers
 Estoit de toz autres divers,
 Qu'ainz teus ne fu ne ja mès n'iert;
 Ainz ne vi, se nus m'en requiert,
 Si mal pont ne si male planche:
 D'une espée forbie et blanche
 Estoit li ponz sur l'eve froide;
 Mes l'espée estoit fort et roide
 Et avoit deus lances de lorc.
 De chascune part ot un tronc
 Ou l'espée estoit cloufichiée; . . .
 Si ne semble pas qui la voit
 Qu'ele puisse grant fès porter."³

v. 3017

Seeing the bridges and the monsters on the further shore, his companions in vain try to dissuade Lancelot from crossing it. He does not heed them, but proceeds to take off the armour from his legs and hands, preferring to wound himself on the sword's sharp edges rather than to risk slipping into the river.

Much of this is repeated in the prose⁴ Lancelot. The British Museum Ms. 10293, for instance, uses almost the same words in

³ Cf. *Romania*, XII, 468, 473, and Foerster's edition of the poem, *op. cit.*

Chrétien's sword bridge is realistically treated by several mediaeval artists. As these instances have in general escaped notice, a brief list may be given below. For the reference to Caen and the British Museum casket, I am indebted to my colleague, Miss Helen Griffith.

Ivory panel set in cover of Add. Ms. 36615, Brit. Mus., early fourteenth century. A knight on his hands and knees crosses a great sword which stretches across turbulent waves. A shower of darts descends upon him. Cf. Catalogue of Additional MSS., 1900-1905, British Museum, Lond., 1907.

Ivory casket, fourteenth century, Brit. Mus., reproduced in *Guide to the Mediaeval Room*, Brit. Mus., 1907, p. 163; also in the *Burlington Magazine*, June, 1904, p. 288-319. The whole casket is carved with scenes from the romances. As in the panel, the companion piece to Lancelot is Gawain on the "Bed Perilous."

Carving on a capital of St. Pierre, Caen. Cf. Dawson Turner, *Letters from Normandy*, Lond., 1820, II, 179; Didron Ainé, *Les Triomphes, Annales Archéologiques*, XXIII, 323 (1863), dates the carving in the fourteenth century.

Miniatuure in Ms. No. 115, f. 355. Bibl. Nat. Paris, reproduced by A. Gasté, *Un Chapiteau de l'Eglise Saint Pierre de Caen*, Caen, 1887, Plate II.

⁴ Ed. by H. O. Sommer, Carnegie Institute, Washington, 1911, Vol. IV, Part II, p. 200. The ms. is of the thirteenth century. With this and the *Charette* passage cf. that in the *Livre d'Artus* (Bibl. Nat. ff. 337) summarized by E. Freymond, *Zeitschr. f. frz. Spr.*, XVII, § 113.

describing the river. That the bridge is thought of as actual sword is shown by the account of the preparations made for Lancelot's crossing. Those of his company "laçent les pans de son hauberc emsamble et li cueusent a gros fies de fer qu'il auoient aporte et . . . ses manicles dedens li ont poiez a boine poi caude . . . et tant des pans comme il ot entre les cuisses. Et ce fu pour miex tenir contre (le trenchant de) lespee. . . . Lors se met desour la plance a cheuauchons si armes comme il estoit. . . . Et cil de la tour qui le voient en sont tout esbahi . . . mais quil voient quil se traîne par dessus lespee trenchant a la force des bras et a lempoignement des genous."

With the notable popularity and influence of the Lancelot stories in general this paper has nothing to do, but it is interesting to note that the sword bridge *motif* in the fourteenth century had become practically a convention. In the *Sone de Nausay* it is evident that the poet did not feel it necessary to describe the bridge, presumably because its character was too well known:

"Et priés de la une archie
Ot en mer une grant cauchie
Qui jusc'as murs pas ne venoit;
Mais ensi que on tiesmongnoit
Qu la fu li pons de l'espee
U ot mointe tieste copee
Quant Meleagaus en fu sire."⁶

v. 17189

Other examples from romantic story which have been cited as analogous to the sword bridge are to be found in the *Mule sans Frein*,⁶ in the bridge tradition ascribed to Merlin,⁷ the *Perlesvaus*⁸

⁶ Ed. by M. Goldschmidt, *Litterarischer Verein in Stuttgart*, No. 216, 1809. Cited by Foerster, p. XLIX; by J. D. Bruce, *P. M. L. A.*, XV, 336. Bruce discusses the relation of the Latin romance, *Vita Meriadoci* and the French poem. He thinks the mysterious island home of Gundebald in the *Vita Mer.*, a "terra de qua nemo revertitur" to which narrow causeways lead, represents a debased form of the description here quoted from the *Sone de Nausay*. The latter may not represent direct, but it certainly shows indirect, borrowing from Chrétien's poem.

⁷ Cited by G. Paris, *op. cit.*, 510, n. 2. See *Histoire Littéraire*, XIX, 722, and the new edition of the poem by R. T. Hill, Baltimore, 1911. Verses 390-415 tell how Gawain comes to the river "plus bruiauz que Loire—Si horrible, si cruel—ce est li flus au diable!"

Tant est alez par la rivage,
Que il a la planche trovec,

Qui n'est mie plus d'un dor lee,
Mais ele estoit de fer trestote.

He gets across by aid of the mule:

"Mes assez sovent avenoit
Que la moitez do pie estoit
Fors la planche par desor."

Cf. *Romania*, XLI, 144.

¹ Noted by L. Paton, *Studies in Fairy Mythology of Arthurian Romance*, Boston, 1903, p. 85, n. 3. Cf. Malory, *Le Morte Darthur*, Bk. II, ch. 19: "Then Merlin let make a bridge of iron and steel into that island, . . . and it was but half a foot broad, and there shall never a man pass that bridge, . . . but if he were a passing good man and a knight without treachery or villainy." Although the form of this bridge is possibly suggestive of Chrétien's, its character is essentially different. It is a variant of those tests, usually of chastity, which form so popular a motif in mediaeval story. The tests were made by means of a fairy horn or mantle, girdle, crown, chair, flower, ring, etc. Cf. F. J. Child, *English and Scottish Ballads*, I, 257-274, 507; II, 502; III, 503; IV, 454; V, 212, 289. For the Celtic origin of the horn and mantle tests, cf. T. P. Cross, *Mod. Phil.*, X, 289 ff. The magical bridge which no imperfect knight or lady of Arthur's court could cross, appears in *Der jüngere Titurel*, written before 1272 (ed. K. A. Hahn, Leipzig, 1842, p. 232). Hans Sachs retells the story with Vergil for the magician in *König Artus mit der ehbrecher-brugk* (*Dichtungen*, ed. Goedeke, I, 175). Cf. Child, I, 267, and Comparetti, *Virgil in the Middle Ages*, tr. E. F. Benecke, Lond., 1895, p. 339. Child notes: "Die Brücke zu Karidol" (Cardoil) is alluded to in *Der Spiegel* by Meister Altswert" (ed. W. Holland u. A. Keller, Stuttgart, 1850, p. 179, v. 10-13). It is evident that the bridge test was late and can in no way explain Chrétien's idea in introducing the sword bridge.

² *Perlesvaus*, tr. S. A. Evans, *High History of the Holy Grail*, 1808, Everyman's Library, 1910, from the French prose romance, *Perceval le Gallois*, ed. C. Potvin, Mons, 1866-71, Vol. I. Cf. the dissertation of W. A. Nitze, *Perlesvaus*, Baltimore, 1902, p. 104, note. The description of the bridge is given in the *High History*, p. 84-5. Gawain comes to King Fisherman's castle, which is surrounded by great waters which are crossed by three bridges. The first bridge (the Pont de l'Anguille) seemed a bow shot in length and a breadth not more than a foot. A knight came to the head of the bridge and bade Gawain cross without misgiving. Gawain "commendeth himself to God and smiteth his horse with spurs and findeth the bridge large and wide as he goeth forward, for by this passing were proven most of the knights. When he had passed beyond, the bridge, that was a draw-bridge, lifted itself by engine behind him, for the water ran too swiftly for any other bridge to be made." The second bridge seemed to him as long as the other, and "so far as he could judge, the bridge was of ice, feeble and thin, and of a great height above the water." When he came in the midst thereof, "he seeth the bridge was the fairest and strongest that he ever beheld, and the abutments thereof were full of images." The third bridge was not terrifying. It had columns of gold; the figure of Christ appeared on the gate; at the sides were images of the Virgin and St. John, made out of gold and precious stones. An angel, "passing fair," pointed to the chapel where was the Holy Grail.

and its Welsh version, *Y Seint Greal*,⁹ and again in the Dutch *Walewein*.¹⁰ The Perilous bridge also appears in Gautier's continuation of Chrétien's *Perceval ou Le Conte du Gral*.¹¹ The three instances (*Perlesvaus*, *Y Seint Greal*, *Walewein*), especially, show a confusion of ideas which can be made to prove almost anything. Chrétien's realistic and striking description of the sword bridge serves simply as a starting point, if, indeed, it be even that. The later texts describe a perilous bridge which suggests in some details the fairy bridge of old Celtic story, but is chiefly reminiscent of the soul bridge of Christian vision literature. It is in accounting for Chrétien's bridge by way of these later developments, and in defining the type of his original that the divergence of critical opinion begins.

An article read by title at the Modern Language Meeting, January, 1913, would undoubtedly offer much interesting material in this general connection. It was by S. L. Galpin on *The Perilous Bridge in French Allegory*. The résumé in *P. M. L. A.*, XXVIII, p. XIX, *Proceedings* for 1912, says: "the type of perilous bridge found in French allegorical poems is easily recognizable as an adaptation of the well-known bridge of judgment of Christian vision literature."

⁹ Ed. R. Williams, *Selections from the Hengwrt MSS.*, Lond., 1876-92, II, 241, 593. Same as above. Cf. J. Rhys, *Arthurian Legend*, Oxford, 1891, p. 56. The variability of size (the Welsh text says the bridge widened so that two carts might have passed abreast) recalled to Professor Rhys the Bridge of Souls in the Irish visions. See here notes 14-16. He derived the name, Bridge of the Eel (*Anguille*), from the Snake, or Rainbow River which, Taliessin said, flowed around the world. Prof. Nitze, *Perlesvaus*, p. 104, suggests the reading *Aiguile*, Needle. If we are to deal with allegory, certainly it would seem that the Grail bridge was as effective a test of virtue as the "Needle's Eye" of the Scriptures!

¹⁰ *Roman van Walewein*, ed. W. J. A. Jonckbloet, Leiden, 1846-48, v. 4939. (See here, page 183.)

¹¹ Perceval crossed a glass bridge by the aid of a mule lent him by a maiden. A knight then persuaded him to attempt crossing the Bridge Perilous and to attend the tourney at the Castle Orguellous. Cf. J. Weston, *Legend of Sir Perceval*, I, 24; 266. The Bridge Perilous was partly built by a fairy for her lover, Carimedic (Potvin, 28,825); when he was killed she left it incomplete, and vowed that none but the most valiant knight should cross it. When Perceval reached the high arch of the middle of the bridge, the half he had crossed swung around and fastened itself to the other side, so that he was enabled to cross in safety. Cf. Weston, II, 241; Paton, p. 85, n. 3: Nitze, *P. M. L. A.*, XXIV, 375.

The influence of the marvels of Irish story is to be seen in both episodes. (See below, n. 25; 34.) Whether the bridge episode was elaborated in the Latin version which was according to Professor Nitze (*Glastonbury and the Holy Grail, Modern Philology*, I, 257) the immediate successor of Chrétien's *Perceval*, it is impossible to say, but it is characteristic of the transformation of romantic into ecclesiastical story in the *Perceval* and the *Perlesvaus* to find the "active bridge" of pagan Irish story taking on many of the attributes of the soul bridge of Christian legend.

In his famous study of Chrétien's poem in *Romania*, XII, p. 508 ff., Gaston Paris maintained that as Méléagant's kingdom could be identified with the Otherworld of pagan Celtic belief, the bridge which gave access to it could be taken as the Celtic version of "une croyance répandue chez un grand nombre de peuples, aryens et autres, qu'il faut passer sur un semblable pont pour entrer dans le royaume des morts." He referred briefly to the Tchinvat bridge of the books of Zoroaster,¹² and to the similar bridge in Talmudic and Mohammedan tradition. In each case the bridge was crossed by the soul after death, and by its varying size and danger, it served as a judgment test. For the good it broadened to the length of nine javelins; for the wicked it narrowed to the width of a hair or thread, and this slender support became as sharp as a razor. The Tchinvat or *Kinvad* bridge, which may be taken as the archetype, stretched between high mountain peaks, and under it flowed a river. The dogs of Death¹³ guided souls to the bridge, and protected good souls from the assaults of demons. A perfumed breeze blew from Heaven across the bridge. A celestial mansion could be seen. If the soul missed its footing on the bridge it fell into the abode of Endless Darkness.

¹² *Avesta*, tr. J. Darmsteter, *Sacred Books of the East*, Oxford, 1895, vols. IV and XXIII. For the *Kinvad* bridge see pages 156, 158, 218-9. Cf. D'Ancona, *I Precursori di Dante*, p. 46; W. Geiger, *Grundriss der Iranischen Philologie*, Strassburg, 1896-1904; II, 684; also his *Civilization of the Ancient Iranians*, tr. Peshota Sanjānā, Lond., 1885, I, 100-102; N. Söderblom, *Rev. de l'hist. des Religions*, XXXIX, 411-412; *La vie future d'après le Mazdeisme*, 926. Cf. the prayer of the modern Parsi (cited by E. B. Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, N. Y., 1889, II, 100): "I believe . . . in the stepping over the bridge Chinvat in an invariable recompense of good deeds . . . and bad deeds."

For the Mohammedan belief see Paris, *op. cit.*, p. 508; D'Herbelot, *Bibliothèque Orientale*. Sir Walter Scott, *Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border*, Edin., 1868, III, 136, comments on the "Brig o' Dread" in the Lyke-Wake dirge of the Yorkshire peasants.

¹³ M. Bloomfield, *Cerberus, The Dog of Hades, A Study in Comparative Mythology*, 1904; Tylor, II, 50, cites among other stories that of the Algonquin Indians in which a great dog guards the swinging bridge leading to the Villages of the Dead. Paris (509, n. 2) thinks the phantom lions seen by Lancelot reminiscent of the monsters which in so many myths guard the Land of the Dead. The concept reappears in several mediaeval visions of Heaven and Hell, but it is difficult to suppose that Chrétien's lions have any connection beyond that of a possible but most remote common source with the creatures described in the Vision of Tundal to which Paris alludes.

With some of these attributes of the Oriental soul bridge in mind, Gaston Paris sought to find analogues in ancient Celtic tradition. An analysis of the evidence presented by him and others shows that three points are at issue:

1. That the soul bridge, as a concept comparable to that in the *Avesta*, is found in Celtic literature:
2. That for western religious legend it is of Celtic origin:
3. That the sword bridge may be identified with it.

The analogue which Paris sought, he found in the writings of the Celtic visionaries. It is, of course, undeniable that many details drawn from pagan lore appear in these writings, and Paris believed that the bridge concept which appears in the twelfth century visions of Tundal¹⁴ and Owain,¹⁵ or as he might have added, the still

¹⁴ *Visio Tungdali*, ed. A. Wagner, Erlangen, 1882. The spirit of Tundal, a wicked Irish landlord, is taken while his body lies in a deathlike trance through Hell and Heaven. In Hell he sees two bridges, the first is a thousand feet long and one foot wide! It stretches from one mountain to another over a foul-smelling abyss. The second bridge is strewn with spikes; it is two miles long and scarcely a hand's breadth wide; it is guarded by fiery monsters. Over it Tundal has to drive a cow which he had once stolen.

The vision seems to have taken place about 1149 and to have been written down before 1153, Ward, II, 417. Wagner lists 54 MSS. exclusive of those in the British Museum, which show the wide popularity of the story in Europe. Six MSS. of the twelfth century have the Prologue by Frater Marcus, the Irish monk, who wrote down the story which Tundal told him in Irish. The inclusion of the vision in the *Chronicon of Helinand*, a Cistercian monk of Froidmont (d. cir. 1229), whence it passed into the *Speculum Historiale* (Bk. XXVII, ch. 88) of Vincent of Beauvais, gives a further indication of its popularity and the means of its dispersion. Cf. Ward, II, 424; V. H. Friedel & K. Meyer, *La vision de Tondale*, 1907.

¹⁵ The Middle-English poem, *Owain Miles*, ed. E. Kolbing, *Eng. Stud.*, I, 99-112, and Marie de France's *L'Espurgatoire*, ed. T. A. Jenkins, Chicago, 1903, are both derived from the *Tractatus de Purgatorio de S. Patrice* of the Benedictine monk, Henry of Saltrey, written about 1189. Henry wrote it down from the account given by Gilbert of Louth, a Cistercian monk, who had heard it from Owain himself, an Irish knight, who had visited St. Patrick's Purgatory, a pit on an island in Lough Derg, County Donegal. Among the other torments which Owain encountered was the Judgment bridge. It was of dizzy height, so slender that it would scarcely support one foot, and very slippery. When he called on the name of Christ the bridge grew firm and widened at every step.

Two of the earliest written references to the fame of this Purgatory and the Pilgrimages to it, are in the *Vita S. Patrice* of the Cistercian, Jocelin of Furness, written about 1183, and in the *Topographia Hibernia* of Giraldus Cambrensis about 1189. These early accounts localize the story in different places and neither mentions Owain, nor the bridge. Cf. Ward, II, 438. As Th. Wright

earlier one of Adamman, the three most famous visions of Irish origin, was such a survival. The visions describe a judgment bridge, varying in size, spanning the abysses of Hell, and crossed only by the dead or the spirit of the mortal to whom the vision was vouchsafed. The concept of the bridge, obviously the same in each case, goes back to the same source, or at least to the same line of tradition. As to what this was, C. S. Boswell, the most authoritative student of the *Fis Adamnáin*,¹⁶ is, perhaps, needlessly dubious when he says :

points out, *St. Patrick's Purgatory*, Lond., 1844, p. 133: "It appears from Jocelin's account that even so late as the end of the 12th century, the legend had hardly become fixed in the definite form which Henry's narrative gave to it." An old tradition records that Tiernan O'Rourke, Prince of Bressny, went in 1152 to the Purgatory. O'Connor (*St. Patrick's Purgatory, Lough Derg*, Dublin, 1895, p. 93), who cites the story, makes the improbable suggestion that the bridge episode of the Owain stories was due to the suggestion of the actual bridge between the Saint's island and the mainland.

The great popularity of the Owain story, once it was fairly started, is shown by its early translation into French and English, by its inclusion in the *Chronica Majora* (ed. Luard, Rolls Series, II, 192), which Matthew Paris wrote about 1299; by the great number of early MSS. Cf. Jenkins, p. 45, 85; E. Mall, *Romanische Forschungen*, VI, 149; C. Fritzsche, *Rom. Forsch.*, III, 360; P. Meyer, *Notices et Extraits*, XXXIV, I, 238 (1801); Ward, *Cat. of Rom.*, II, 445.

The account of the bridge in the Middle-English versions is much elaborated. Its height, slipperiness, its sharpness, are dwelt upon. It is highly arched in the middle and is likened to a "bent bowe." A. C. L. Brown, *Iwain, Harvard Studies in Phil. and Lit.*, VIII, 124, thinks the description shows traces of Celtic influence as this arched bridge resembles the one crossed by Cuchulinn on his way to Scathach's abode (*Tochmarc Emere*).

An interesting late version of the Owain story is found in the Breton *Mystère, Luis Enius ou Le Purgatoire de S. Patrice*, ed. G. Dottin, Paris, 1911, p. 350. Enius (the Spanish name for Owain) crossed the slippery ice bridge which spanned Hell's torments. He was aided by an invisible hand. A sweet breeze blew towards him from the celestial palace across the bridge. Cf. the Avesta accounts.

Professor G. L. Hamilton draws my attention to L. Fratri, *Tradizioni storiche del Purgatorio di San Patrizio, Giornale Storico della Letteratura Italiana*, VIII, 140; XVII, 46.

¹⁶ Ed. Windisch, *Irische Texte*, I: translated by C. S. Boswell, *An Irish Precursor of Dante*, Lond., 1908. For the bridge see p. 39. It was high in the middle, low at each end, it spanned a fiery river. For some who crossed it, it was broad; for others narrow at first, then broad; for still others it was broad at first but presently became so strait that they fell from it perforce into the mouths of fiery serpents.

Windische, *Irische Texte*, I, 167, ascribes the existing version to the tenth, possibly to the ninth century, which latter date is accepted by Zimmer (*Zeitsch.*

"It is possible that the author (of the *Fis Adamnáin*) found his immediate prototype in the writings of St. Gregory, with which he was likely to be acquainted; equally possible that the idea was derived from the traditions of the Eastern Church with which it is probable that he had come in contact; or, again, from some floating tradition, originally emanating from either of the above sources." In another place (p. 112), Boswell speaks definitely of Gregory's account as "passing on to the Irish school the bridge incident of Oriental myth."

The concept of the visionary soul bridge undoubtedly came from the East. As it was incorporated, however, as early as the sixth century in ecclesiastical writings of Western Europe, there seems no reason for supposing that the monastic writers who recorded the particular visions mentioned above had recourse to any save the Western, and probably the literary tradition. The vision bridge occurs not only in the *Dialogues*¹⁷ of Gregory the Great but in the *Historia Francorum*¹⁸ of Gregory of Tours; in the eighth century in the vision of the Monk of Wenlock;¹⁹ and most important of all, in the expanded Latin versions of the *Visio S. Pauli*²⁰ The latter, *f. deutsch. Alt.*, XXXIII, 285, n. 2). The two MSS. are of the early twelfth and late fourteenth century.

¹⁷ Latin and French texts of the *Dialogues*, ed. W. Foerster, Erlangen, 1886. In the soldier's vision no details about the bridge are given. It stretches over the river of hell, and the mansion of the blessed is on the other side. Cf. Ward, *op. cit.*, p. 399, and Paris, *op. cit.*, p. 508. Becker, p. 18, is wrong in saying "the first Christian vision in which we find the bridge is that of St. Paul." Gregory's account is taken over in the *Legenda Aurea*, ed. Th. Graesse, Dresden, 1846, ch. CLXIII, p. 733, *De commemoratione animarum*.

¹⁸ Noted by G. Baist, *Die Totenbrücke*, *Zts. f. rom. Phil.*, XIV, 159. Only one important detail about the bridge is given in this vision of the Abbot Sunniulf, i. e., that it is scarcely the width of a man's foot. The bridge stretches over a burning pool. For the Latin text of Gregory of Tours, see H. Omont, *Historia Francorum*, Lib. IV, c. 33, p. 127, Paris, 1886.

¹⁹ Cited by E. Becker, *Mediaeval Visions of Heaven and Hell*, Baltimore, 1899, p. 17. I have found no other reference to this vision. Cf. pp. 17, 44, 76, 85, for discussion of the Visions of St. Paul, Owain and Tundal.

²⁰ The bridge episode does not appear in the fourth century Greek text of the Vision of St. Paul, nor in the Latin of the eighth century (text ed. by M. M. Rhodes in J. A. Robinson's *Contributions to Biblical and Patristic Literature*, Cambridge, 1893). Of the six groups or redactions into which H. Brandes divided the later versions (*Ein Beitrag zur Visionslit.*, Diss., Halle, 1885, p. 75-80) "die Brücke der gerechten, welche durch ihre lange und ihre schmalheit charakterisiert wird, bleibt unerwähnt in frz. und engl. II" (the numerals refer to the

began its great popularity in the ninth century and served more or less as model for the many visions of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.²¹ This continuous ecclesiastical tradition, the earliest

groups); "Lat. und Engl. IV heben hervor dass die erlaubnis des übergangs vom dem verdienste der seelen abhängt." (Brandes, *Über die Quellen der mittel-engl. Versionen der Paulus Vision*, Engl. Stud., VII, 58.) P. Meyer, *Romania*, XXIV, 359, 589, lists twenty-five MSS. (twelfth to fifteenth century) of this fourth redaction. Only three examples were known to Brandes. M. Meyer states that his list is still incomplete. Six rhymed French versions are given by him in *Notice sur le ms. français 24862 de la Bibliothèque Nationale, Notices et Extraits des MSS.*, XXXV, 155 ff., cf. *Romania*, XXXVI, 535; Längfors, XLI, 210. Cf. Ward, *Catalogue of Romances*, II, 396-416. T. Batiouchkof, *Le Débat de l'Ame et du Corps*, *Romania*, XX, 33, cites Italian versions of the *Visio Pauli* in which the soul bridge appears.

An interesting example of the soul bridge in art is found in an illumination in Ms. 815, fol. 59, Bibl. Municipale, Toulouse, a fourteenth century Ms. of St. Paul's Vision, written in England. Souls on their hands and knees cross the high, arching bridge. At the other end of the bridge is the gate of Paradise. Cf. P. Meyer, *Romania*, XXIV, 358.

²¹ For general discussion of vision literature see Becker, *op. cit.* In the list of visions given by C. Fritzsche, *Die lateinischen Visionen des Mittelalter*, Rom. Forsch., III, 354, one vision of the fifth century, three of the sixth, four of the seventh, one of the eighth, thirteen of the ninth, three of the tenth, three of the eleventh, three to the middle of the twelfth, are listed. The list is incomplete, but suggestive. Representative visions in which the bridge occurs are those already cited; sixth to ninth century, visions recorded by Gregory the Great and Gregory of Tours; Vision of the Monk of Wenlock; Visions of St. Paul, Latin, French, German, English, etc.; tenth century vision of Adamnan, Ireland; vision of Alberic, Italy, 1129; of Tundale, Ireland, 1149; of Owain, Ireland, 1153; of Thurcill, England, 1206. (Cf. Ward, *op. cit.*, 416, 436, 493, 506.)

For Alberic's vision see Dante's *Works*, Padua, 1822, II, 284. The bridge was over the river of Purgatory; it was easily crossed by the righteous; the evil were weighted down with heavy loads; when they came to the middle the bridge narrowed to the size of a thread. Before coming to the bridge Alberic saw a long ladder of hot iron, covered with spikes, on which sinners were forced to climb. Dr. Becker, *op. cit.*, p. 44, considers this a variant of the bridge theme. Cf. Vision of Tundale, note 14.

In the vision of Thurcill (pr. in Roger of Wendover's *Flowers of History*, ed. H. O. Coxe, Eng. Hist. Soc., L, 1841; see C. Gross, *Sources Eng. Hist.*, L, 1900, p. 310) the bridge is very long, is covered with nails and spikes, and leads to the mount of joy. Cf. Ward, II, 506.

Later visions, such as that of William of Staunton, Durham, 1409, an account of a visit to Saint Patrick's Purgatory, are too late to be of interest here. The bridge and the sharp runged ladder are found in this vision. Cf. Ward, *Cat.*, II, 486.

Interesting articles by S. L. Galpin, *Publications Modern Language Association*, XXV, pp. 274-308, and *Romanic Review*, II, 54-60, discuss the influence of

record of which antedates by three centuries the date which any student has assigned to the *Fis Adamnáin*, in its turn the earliest Irish record in which the soul bridge appears, makes it highly improbable that the Irish visionaries were borrowing or adapting the idea of the soul bridge from any surviving pagan lore. The variable Bridge of the Dead, as was briefly pointed out by R. Thurneysen in his *Keltoromanisches*, Halle, 1884, p. 21, occurs solely, so far as Celtic literature is concerned, in ecclesiastical legend. To attempt, even tentatively, to argue as does G. Baist, *Die Totenbrücke (Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, XIV, 159)*, that the soul bridge, already conceived as a judgment test and thing of vision in the oldest version of the legend in the west, was originally Celtic, "in Urverwandtschaft mit dem Mythus der Zendavest oder ohne solche," that it resulted from the peculiarly Irish concept of the Otherworld as an island, and that it was introduced by Irish pilgrims who are known to have been in France and Gaul in the sixth century, is to venture into unprofitable discussion. There is absolutely no evidence to support a theory that ignores on the one hand the clear implication of literary tradition and on the other the fact that the soul-bridge concept represents a developed eschatological stage to which pagan Irish belief never attained. If ideas—to use the language of a more exact science than folk-lore—not equivalent to the same thing are *not* to be made equal to each other, —it is necessary to remember that the soul bridge, in even the most primitive myth in which it occurs, is characterized by its visionary quality; its association with the dead and a recognized Otherworld; and, if it is a Bridge of Difficulty, by its function as a judgment test. It is, therefore, much more than the mere idea of a bridge entrance to a land in which marvels occur. The soul bridge, whether it occurs "in the religious legends of cultured races from Vedic India to Iceland, or of such primitive races as the Quoits of Aleutia, the Bagdads of Nilghiris,"²² has recognizable attributes which dis-

mediaeval Christian Vision Literature on French allegorical poems, such as De Deguileville's *Pèlerinage de l'Ame* and the second part of the *Roman de la Rose* by Jean de Meun.

²² Boswell, *op. cit.*, 132; cf. Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, Index, Bridge of the Dead, Hades, Purgatory, Underworld, etc. In his *Researches into the Early History of Mankind*, ch. XII, he gives a collection of the myths of the Heaven bridge. Cf. *Primitive Culture*, II, 95, n. 1.

tinguish it from the bridges in extant old Irish story. To confuse the two types is to blur the essential character of Irish paganism.

In the first place the pagan literature of Ireland, which is untouched by Christian influence, gives us no ground for equating The Irish Land of Promise or Land of the Ever Young with the Land of the Dead, a concept which is clearly discernible in the most ancient Greek mythology and in the religious legends of races much more primitive. The Irish describe an Earthly Paradise, an Elysium divorced from all idea of death,²³—in short, a fairy realm. It lies beyond or beneath the sea, or it is hidden in a mound. In non-Celtic sources there are many parallels for its location. It is distinctive in not being conceived specifically as a region of the dead. Immortals inhabit it; mortals go to it in mortal form and return without too great difficulty,²⁴ and without recognizing it as anything more than a land of spectacular beauty and pleasure. The taboo against touching earth is by no means inevitably imposed on the returning Irish hero. He who had achieved the adventure in his own body and largely by means of his own initiative bears no resem-

²³ The usual names for the Irish Otherworld are: Pleasant Plain (Magh Mell); Land of Promise (Tif Tairngire); Land of the Living (Tir na m Beo); Land of the Youthful (Tir na n-Oé). Cf. L. Gougaud, *Les Chrétientés Celtes*, Paris, 1911, p. 25: "Ce (i. e., Magh Mell) n'est pas là, un séjour pour les morts, comparable à l'Hades des Grecs. C'est le pays des dieux, des fées, des immortels." Cf. also J. A. MacCulloch, *Celtic Abode of the Blest, Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, ed. J. Hastings, Edin., 1909, II, 689-96; E. Hull, *The Idea of Hades in Irish Literature, Folk-Lore*, XVIII, pp. 123-66, 1907. She denies that in Irish pagan tradition there is any trace of a belief in life after death. A. Nutt, *ibid.*, p. 445 ff. Nutt in this article maintains Miss Hull's point, and replies to D'Arbois de Jubainville who disputed it. The philological side of the question is represented by endeavors to interpret the name Meléaguant, or Melvas. F. Lot, *Romania*, XXIV, 328, takes it to mean "Prince of the Dead" (Maelvas, Mael, prince; Vas = "bas qui en gallois ancien signifiait "mort" tout comme en Irlandais"). Lot, however, admits that Rhys's interpretation is entirely satisfactory. Cf. Rhys, *Arthurian Legend*, p. 51, Melwas = Maelgwas. (Was = youth = the Prince Ever Young.) For general comment and studies on the Irish Otherworld cf. G. Kittredge, *American Journal of Philology*, VII, 196 ff.

²⁴ Cf. the stories cited in note 2. In each case the hero returns to earth. In the tale of *Cormaic i Tir Tairngiri, Irische Texte*, III, 212, Cormac returns with his whole family from the realm of the god Mannanan; so Cuchullin returns from that of the goddess Fand, *Serglige Conchulaind, Ir. Texte*, I, 197. In the *Imrama* tales, as in many of the fairy mistress type, the hero returns to tell his adventures. Summaries of *Bran, Maelduin*, etc., in Brown, *Harvard Studies*, VIII, ch. III.

blance to those bodiless spirits which in non-Celtic folk-lore enter by way of death or dream or magic into a world recognized as other than mortal.

In the second place, though strange and sometimes perilous bridges do lead to the Irish Otherworld,²⁵ their attributes are wholly

²⁵ The oldest redaction of the *Tochmarc Emere* is represented by Ms. Rawlinson B. 512, Bodleian; cf. *Revue Celtique*, XI, 439. The account from the Book of Fermoy, *Do Foglum Chonculain*, *Revue Celtique*, XXIX, 137, is as follows:

"Thus was the Bridge of Leaps . . . when one leapt upon it, it was narrowed till it was as narrow as a hair, and it was as sharp as a . . . , and as slippery as an eel's tail. At another time it would rise so that it was as high as a mast." On p. 137 the comparison "sharp as an orrldadh" is made. Stokes, Notes, p. 151, queries "some sort of a sharp instrument? cognate with *oardleach*, a cutting (cf. *oard-sleg*). For the LU version see Hull, *Cuchullin Saga*, p. 75.

The following list of bridges in Irish story is not complete, but it is, perhaps, sufficiently representative.

Tochmarc Emere, E. Hull, *Cuchullin Saga*, p. 75; Scathach's bridge described above; a second bridge is mentioned later, the Téd Chlis ("something like a tight rope for dancers," O'Curry, *Manners and Customs*, II, 371). To walk this and fight on it twice with savage opponents was even more of a feat for Cuhullin than crossing the "active" bridge.

Imra Maelduin, *Revue Celt.*, IX, 447-495; X, 50-95. On the seventeenth island Maelduin finds a bridge of glass; when anyone stepped on it, he fell backwards. A brazen door which gave access to the fortress beyond the bridge made sleep-compelling music.

Compert Mongain, tr. K. Meyer, *Voyage of Bran*, Lond., 1895. Mongan builds a bridge by enchantment while he is on his way to visit the wife he has lost. He causes it to break when he and the priest who acted as the wife's guardian were half way over.

Echtra Airt, ed. R. Best, *Eriu*, III, 149; cf. summary in Boswell, p. 139. In the course of his adventures Airt has to cross a narrow bridge over an icy river. The bridge is defended by a giant.

Echtra Chloinne Righ na H-Iorruidhe, Irish Texts, 1899, p. 180. Buinne Rough Strong comes to a bridge between two islands; corpses lie on the shores, spiked heads border the bridge. (For this detail, heads on spikes, see Child's *Ballads*, V, 482; Schofield, *Harvard Studies*, IV, 175; Brown, *Harvard Studies*, VIII, 137.)

In a modern Gaelic tale recorded by Campbell, *Tales of the West Highlands*, 1,261, the giantess Maol, when pursued to the edge of a river, pulls a hair out of her head and thus makes a bridge over which she runs. Superficially this suggests the *pont cheveu* (Paris, *Romania*, XII, 509), but it has no more real connection with that idea than has the account of the sun or moonbeam bridge up which in the ballad of "The Bitter Withy" the little Christ led his companions. In his study of the ballad, G. H. Gerould, *P. M. L. A.*, XVI, thinks this idea Oriental in origin, that it early slipped into ecclesiastical legend, and so reached the common people from whom the ballad came. Dr. Gerould notes,

different from those of the soul bridge. This fact, however, has not been recognized by those who have been willing to accept a single instance in pagan Irish story as proof of their theory that the soul bridge idea is of universal occurrence. This instance is the "Bridge of Leaps" in the *Tochmarc Emere*, a famous Irish story of which there are extant several versions. In the oldest version, the only representative of a pre-Norse redaction, the bridge is omitted altogether. The version of this story, which is usually cited with reference to the bridge, seems to be that of the Book of Fermoy,²⁵ a late manuscript of the fifteenth century. If one turns to the older text in the *Lebor na h-Uidre* (compiled about 1100) it would seem that the basis for the identification with the soul bridge of this "Bridge of Leaps" which the hero Cuchullin crossed on his way to Scathach's realm, is that it gave access to a seeming Otherworld. Without this suggestion of environment or the aid of

p. 144, that the word "lance" is substituted for bridge in one inedited version. The substitution seems purely fortuitous.

A story which scholars have generally held to be of originally Celtic character is that recorded by Antoine de la Sale in *La Salade*, a work written between 1438-1442 (ed. W. Söderhjelm, *Antoine de la Sale et la Légende de Tannhäuser*, in *Mémoires de la Société Néo-Philologique à Helsingfors*, 1897, II, 101-67). De la Sale heard the tale on a visit to the Mont de la Sibylle, one of the Apennine peaks near Norcia. The story told him by the peasants was as follows: Whoever entered the cave had to encounter a mighty blast of wind, cross a bridge one foot wide that spanned a brawling torrent and was guarded at one end by two monsters, and also pass through two metal doors that swung back and forth unceasingly, before he came to a large crystal door which led into a beautiful castle. Here in the fairy Otherworld lived the Queen Sibylle. (Quoted from L. Paton, *Fairy Mythology*, p. 53.) Substantially the same story, i. e., of the knight who gets into the mountain cave, lives the Life of Otherworld delights, repents, etc., is told by Andrea da Barberino, *Guerino il Meschino*, written 1391 (ed. Venice, 1816, IV, cap. 134; V, cap. 149). The localization of the mountain Paradise in the many tales and allusions analogous to those just cited, and their bearing on the origin of the Tannhäuser legend, are discussed by G. Paris, *Le Paradis de la Reine Sibylle*, *Revue de Paris*, September, 1897; *La Légende du Tannhäuser*, March, 1898, reprinted in *Légendes du Moyen-Age*, Paris, 1903, pp. 65-109; III, 145; W. A. Neilson, *Origins of the Court of Love*, *Harvard Studies*, VI, 133-35; H. Dübi, *Drei Spätmittelalterliche Legenden in ihrer Wanderung aus Italien durch die Schweiz nach Deutschland*, *Frau Vrene und der Tannhäuser*, *Zeitschr. des Vereins für Volkskunde*, XVII, 249-264 (1907), a reference for which I am indebted to Professor Hamilton; P. S. Barto, *Studies in the Tannhäuser Legend*, *Journal of Engl. and Ger. Phil.*, IX, 293-320 (1909); A. F. J. Remy, *The Origin of the Tannhäuser Legend*, *ibid.*, XII, 1, 32-77 (1913).

the Book of Fermoy, it is doubtful if even the most ardent folklorist would see resemblance between the two. Scathach's bridge was a high arch so constructed that it overthrew anyone setting foot on one end. After two failures Cuchullin had to cross it by one of his "hero's salmon leaps," and one cannot help suspecting that the bridge of such peculiar characteristics exists in the story mainly for the sake of the famous feat. In so far as it is a bridge spanning the water which in almost universal folk-lore separates Earth from the Otherworld,²⁶ Scathach's bridge may, indeed, represent the Celtic version of that most ancient concept. To press the analogy further, however, is to venture on dangerous ground. One has need to remember that the *Tochmarc Emere*, though one of the oldest Irish epics, probably represents, in relation to its original mythic elements, a stage comparatively late. In the Irish stories wherein the Otherworld is apparently discernible, aside from supernaturally exaggerated marvels and pleasures, there is as little real recognition of its essential character as there is in those Arthurian romances in which continually the knights go to and return from a land "dont nul ne retourne." If Scathach's bridge is to represent a Celtic version of the soul bridge of the *Avesta*, then obviously at the time when the *Tochmarc Emere* was composed, it had lost its original significance as the judgment test of the dead. There is little weight in the argument that it would ever develop into that character which in the earliest record of it in Irish legend it would seem to have discarded.

Finally it may be urged that to try to derive the soul bridge concept as it exists in western religious tradition from the Irish fairy bridge is to ignore the fact that the most distinctive feature of the soul bridge, its function as a judgment test, is entirely foreign to the ancient Celtic spirit or belief. One of the most striking things in Old Irish story is its non-ethical quality.²⁷ Ideals of warrior honour, of heroic courage may be inferred from it, but concepts of objective morality, of retributive justice, are conspicuously absent. For his beauty or the fame of his courage the Irish hero was sum-

²⁶ Cf. Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, Index, River of Death; A. Le Braz, G. Dottin, *La Legende de la Mort*, Paris, 1912.

²⁷ "L'eschatologie irlandaise est dénuée de toute signification éthique." L. Mariller, *La Doctrine de la Reincarnation des Ames et les Dieux de l'Ancienne Irlande*, *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, XL, 1899, pp. 86-90; Dom L. Gougaud, *Les Chrétiniens Celtes*, p. 24 ff.

moned to the Otherworld, and there is no indication that "Magh Mell" was considered the special reward of moral or even of militant virtue.²⁸

By its function then, or rather its lack of function, no less than by its form, the Irish Otherworld bridge should be differentiated from the Bridge of the Dead. To identify the two is to disregard the essential attributes of each. Yet scholars have commonly made this identification, and have disputed only as to the pagan or Christian origin of the Otherworld bridge in Irish story. Some have agreed with Thurneysen²⁹ that the soul bridge idea passed directly from ecclesiastical literature into the Irish visions; others have urged that "Scathach's bridge is a variant of the well-known 'Bridge of the Dead' motif"³⁰ of general folk-lore. The danger of disregarding the essential attributes of the soul bridge is evident when it appears that even the bridge in the *Imra Maelduin* (see n. 25) has been said to represent "that Bridge of Difficulty which belongs in Persian and Indian mythology." It will be remembered that this was a judgment bridge, terrible and merciless to the souls of sinners; the sole danger in *Maelduin* is that the man crossing the glass bridge to the enchanted island against the will of its fairy mistress, falls gently backward and is lulled to sleep by sweet music—an effective but scarcely dangerous obstacle. The result of the misapprehension of the nature of the soul bridge and the failure to differentiate it from a fairy bridge is, of course, responsible for the identification with it of Chrétien's sword bridge, a conclusion

²⁸ Cf. the Valhal, which was the reward of the heroic Scandinavian warrior. It is significant that in the most essential feature of pagan Irish tradition, the belief in reincarnations, "there is not to be traced the slightest idea of chastisement or reward"; Nutt, *The Celtic Doctrine of Rebirth*, Lond., 1897. Cf. *Voyage of Bran*, I, 331.

²⁹ Thurneysen's view that the soul bridge passed from ecclesiastical into secular Irish story has been accepted by several scholars. Cf. G. Schiavo, *Zeits. f. rom. Phil.*, XVII, 74, and W. Foerster, *Der Karrenritter*, IV, LXXI. Neither one questions the identification of the sword and the soul bridge. Foerster explains Chrétien's invention as follows: "Das Entführungsmotiv verbunden mit dem Totenreichmotiv ist ein Stoff der Altklassischen Sage die im Mittelalter allgemein bekannt war. . . . Burgen, die im Flachland mit Wasser umgeben waren, sind zu abgedroschen; so konnte er auf die Gaggenhafte Brücke, die über den Totenfluss führt, und die er aus seiner Lektur kannte, gebracht werden."

³⁰ A. C. L. Brown, *Iwain*, *Harvard Studies*, VIII, 75; Boswell, *op. cit.*, see here, n. 33; E. Hull, *Text-Book of Irish Literature*, Lond., 1910, p. 134.

for which Gaston Paris offered almost the only significant evidence. This was a passage from the Dutch *Walewein* which seems to show that mediaeval writers themselves identified the bridges. Paris's own summary of the incident (op. cit., p. 509) may be quoted.

"Gauvain (Walewein) arrive près d'une rivière dont l'eau . . . brûle comme du feu; le seul moyen de la passer est un pont plus aigu et plus tranchant qu'une lame d'acier (v. 4939 ss.). On lui apprend que cette rivière est le purgatoire: les âmes qui désirent arriver au bonheur céleste doivent passer le pont (v. 5824)." From this Paris concludes: "On voit ici clairement l'altération chrétienne d'une ancienne tradition celtique, d'après laquelle 'le pont de l'épée' donnait accès à la terre des morts."

Even if there were evidence in support of the supposed tradition, such an explanation as this completely disregards the conditions under which a romance like the *Walewein* was written. The *Walewein* and the *Perlesvaus* represent a time when monastic writers were more or less consciously competing with romantic fiction;³¹ they reveal the deliberate effort to transform secular into ecclesiastical romance. In the case of the perilous bridge, for instance, the interest of Chrétien's episode is entirely changed. To cross the sword is no longer a romantic achievement, inspired by love, "si li estoit a soffrir douz"; it is a religious adventure. As one notes the immense development of vision writing in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, in itself one of the most important phases of the

³¹ This is so obvious a fact in the literary history of the time that it scarcely needs illustration. One may recall, however, the words of Frère Angier written in 1212 (*La Vie de St. Grégoire*, ed. P. Meyer, *Romania*, XII, 147):

"Les fables d'Artur de Bretaigne
E les chançons de Charlemaigne
Plus sont cherries e meins viles
Que ne soient les evangiles.
Plus est escouté li juliere
Que ne soit saint Pol ou saint Pierre."

Cf. also the Prologue of the *Bestiæ* of Gervaise, *Romania*, I, 426, for the indication it gives of the attitude of the "religious" toward secular literature. The Middle English *Cursor Mundi*, 1320, in its opening lines almost repeats the words of Frère Angier. Professor Nitze has pointed out that the first redaction of the *Perlesvaus* was composed in the interest of Glastonbury Abbey (*Modern Philology*, I, 257); Miss Weston has shown the possible connection of the Wau-chier section of the *Conte del Graal* with Fécamp (*Legend of Sir Perceval*, I, 56). Cf. J. Bedier, *Les Légendes Épiques*, Paris, 1908-13, for the part taken by various monasteries in developing the *Chansons de Geste*.

church's competition with worldly literature; as one notes the constant tendency to elaborate the originally simple idea of the soul bridge (cf. notes 14-18) so that it became one of the most familiar motifs of vision writing; it is impossible not to see in such romances as the *Walewein* or the *Perlesvaus* the direct influence of this strongly rejuvenated church legend. For one who was familiar with the visions, and who was set to the task of rewriting romance, Chrétien's bridge leading to a mysterious realm from which no one returned, over a dark river which the poet in what is almost a stock expression described as "come li fluus al diable," there was but one natural equation to make, and the perilous sword became the bridge spanning the terrors of hell.

The writers of these and other allegorical pieces represent, chronologically and spiritually, a later stage, and they do not, therefore, explain Chrétien's invention. If his description be taken, as it commonly is, to represent the outcome of those processes by which the Celtic Land of Marvel acquired some of the attributes of the Christian Paradise,³² and those by which it was rationalized into stories of fairy realms like Méléagant's, it would seem possible that the bridge, long since a fabled attribute of Paradise, might enter into the story. It is clear, however, that Chrétien's bridge is totally unlike any form of the soul bridge to which allusion has yet been made; it is much more nearly like the fairy bridges of old Irish story which are listed here in note 25. These were crossed by mortals as was Chrétien's, and served simply as the marvellous entrances to a marvellous land. The sword bridge, moreover, plays an integral part in Chrétien's narrative. For even the great lover Lancelot, to cross the bridge is a supreme feat of love, and there is no adequate reason for believing that the most essential element in the passionate adventure that is so realistically described, is to be derived from an utterly unrelated idea drifting out of the vague, confused concept of a Christianized Otherworld.³³

³² The various stages by which the pagan concept of the Irish Otherworld was blended with that of the Christian Paradise are clearly traced by H. Zimmer, *Zts. f. deutsches Alterthum*, XXXIII, 274 ff. Cf. Brown, *Harvard Studies*, VIII, ch. VI, "The Otherworld Landscape."

³³ The marvellous, fantastic nature of the "Bridge of Difficulty" in such versions as the *Tochmarc Emere* is Boswell's reason for discounting Miss Hull's suggestion (*Cuhullin Saga*, p. 75) that the idea came into the Irish stories through

A word may now be said of the Perilous Passage *motif* of Celtic story. It has been shown that whatever may be its remote connection with the Otherworld bridge of general folk-lore, it does not present in the extant remains of old Irish story, any real analogy to the soul bridge into which that concept so commonly developed. The Irish bridges are of fabulous nature,—of glass; bright,³⁴ as Chrétien's was white; they are active; they turn themselves, they overthrow those setting foot on them. They are associated not with death and judgment, but with heroic adventure. The Irish hero exults in the strange ford or pass or bridge where his powers are tested. It is, perhaps, characteristic of Celtic story that in general it is the marvel, rather than the peril of such places, which is emphasized. As a Perilous Passage, the sword bridge, however Scandinavian influence. In the *Edda* Hermôdhr goes to seek the soul of the dead Balder. Coming to the river Giöll, he crosses its golden bridge. The maiden who guards it questions him, knowing that he can not be of the dead because the bridge rings beneath him. In the Otherworld journeys recounted by Saxo Grammaticus in his Danish History (written 1185-1208, ed. O. Elton, Lond., 1894, p. 346, 38), Thorkill guides Gorm Haraldson, the king's son, to the Land of the Giants. On their way to the court of the giants' king, they see a river crossed by a bridge of gold. Their guide does not permit them to cross it because "by the river Nature divided the world of men from the world of monsters, and no mortal track might go further." In the story of Hadding a woman leads the king through a mist to the Underworld. They pass a river of leaden, tumbling waters, whirling divers sort of missiles. It is crossed by a bridge. Beyond are the fighting armies of all men who have been slain by the sword. Unmistakably in each story the bridge is a soul bridge. The idea of retribution does not appear, but each story does represent that belief in the dead, that sense of separation from the living, which we do not find in Irish pagan literature. The more primitive character of the Irish Otherworld bridge is beyond question. Cf. Meyer, *Voyage of Bran*, I, 297, for a summary of the *Erik Saga*, in which there is also an Otherworld journey and the crossing of a bridge over a river that bounds the Land of the Living.

³⁴ Professor A. C. L. Brown in his article on *The Bleeding Lance*, *P. M. L. A.*, XXV, 32, as well as in an article in *Modern Philology*, I, 101, urges that whiteness or shining in some marvellous object such as the Grail lance or Arthur's weapons (described in *Kulhwch and Olwen*), the names of which usually suggest whiteness, is an indication that the object "has passed through the crucible of Celtic fancy." This may be, but the danger of insisting that "this quality of shining is so exclusively Celtic that it goes far by itself to prove Celtic origin" is pointed out by R. Peebles in her dissertation, *The Legend of Longinus*, Baltimore, 1911, 179. She gives numerous instances from saint legends, etc., of a distinctly non-Celtic character, in which this special attribute is made much of. Cf. Brown, *Romanic Review*, III, 158.

amazingly elongated and strangely used, has little real analogy with the much more incredible marvels of Celtic story. Moreover, the form, the realistic quality of an actual sword used as a bridge, and its connection with the romantic episode of Guinevere's rescue, remain unexplained. To the writer's mind these are primary conditions in explaining the nature of the sword bridge. Granting them, it becomes possible to see in Chrétien's description simply the reflection of an idea inherent in the narrative and structurally necessary to it.

It has come to be generally recognized that in *Le Conte de la Charette*, Chrétien made use of Celtic sources, particularly of that type of story in which a fairy woman is carried away by an Otherworld lover or husband to his kingdom. Various scholars³⁵ have traced the steps by which Queen Guinevere descends from the fées, the Etains of Celtic story, and have shown how it came to pass that her mortal husband, Arthur, changed places with her lover Lancelot. Back of that lost French *conte* which was presumably the source of Ulrich van Zatzikhoven's *Lanzelet* and probably preceded Chrétien's poem by some years:³⁶ back of the *Vita Gildae*, written about 1145, in which it is Arthur himself who rescues Guinevere,³⁷ there must have been tales much more primitive. As Gaston Paris writes (*op. cit.*, p. 511):

"C'était donc Arthur qui, pour délivrer sa femme, la belle Guanhavar, . . . franchissait toutes les barrières . . . , passait, sur le redoutable pont de l'épée, le fleuve de feu . . . , combattait et terrassait le ravisseur, et ramenait triomphalement son épouse. Arthur lui-même s'était sans doute substitué à quelque roi plus ancien, et cette héroïque et formidable aventure, . . . était peut-être chantée en Bretagne et en Gaule, sous d'autres noms, avant que César eût franchi les limites de la province et commencé la destruction, destinée à ne plus s'arrêter, de la civilisation gallo-bretonne."

Little indeed of that "épopée mythologique" does Chrétien's

³⁵ Cf. Paris, *Romania*, XII, p. 509; G. Kittredge, *American Journal of Philology*, VII, 176; K. G. T. Webster, *Engl. Stud.*, XXXVI, 340; G. Schoepperle, *Tristan and Iseult, A Study of the Sources of the Romance*, Frankfurt a. Main, 1913, ch. VI and Appendix V, where the most important contributions to the study and the sources of the story of Guinevere's abduction are listed.

³⁶ Cf. Webster, *Eng. Stud.*, XXXVI, 348; G. Paris, *La Littérature Française au Moyen Age*, p. 247.

³⁷ F. Lot, *Romania*, XXVII, 566; Zimmer, *Zts. f. fr. Spr. u. Lit.*, XII, 248.

poem preserve, but if it be granted that as a whole the story represents the chivalric modification of a pagan Celtic story, then the crossing of the sword bridge is presumably of equally primitive character. If it be taken as one of those feats for which the Irish heroes were famous, feats which made Cuchullin worthy of Emer and loved by the goddess Fand, we need not infuse into the story elements which originally had no place there.

As O'Curry (*Manners and Customs*, II, 372) long ago pointed out, feats (Faebhar-chleas) with edged weapons such as knives, swords, or sharp edged shields were one of the three varieties of feats of championship which distinguished the heroes of Emain. In the *Do Fogluim Chonculainn* (Rev. *Celt.*, XXIX, 125, 129) it is told how Cuchullin works his way "cunningly, lightly, over the darts set up against him." In the *Siabur Charpat Conculaind* (Hull, *Cuchullin Saga*, p. 279), among the twenty-seven hero's feats, is listed the edge-feat, and the straightening of the body on the point of a spear. The edge-feat is again referred to in the *Tochmarc Emer* (*ibid.*, p. 59). The edge-feat in fact was one for which Cuchullin was as famous as he was for his rope-feat and his "hero's salmon leap." Though these feats are not described in detail in any of the old texts, there is no mistaking their general character, and this general impression is corroborated by a passage which occurs in a late text. The story is that of *Diarmid and Grainne*, in itself one of the oldest of the Irish legends. Diarmid, who is eloping³⁸ with Grainne, appears before the pursuers sent by Finn, Grainne's husband, in order to distract and delay them. He does various feats on successive days.

"On one day the young hero rose and took with him to the hill two forked poles out of the next wood, and placed them upright; and the Moralltach (great and fierce one), that is the sword of Aonghus an Bhroga, between the two forked poles upon its edge. Then he himself rose exceedingly lightly over it and thrice measured the sword by paces from the hilt to the point, and he came down and asked if there was a man of them to do that feat."

³⁸ "An allusion in the Book of Aicill, a law tract of the tenth century, shows that already at that time the story of the elopement of Diarmid and Grainne was traditional," *Revue Celtique*, XXXIII, 1. This particular exploit of Diarmid with the sword may not, of course, have belonged in the primitive story, but the antiquity of the feat it describes is indisputable.

Two of Finn's champions attempt the feat, but they are cut in two by the terrible sword.

It is not necessary to use this passage as more than illustration. There can be no question that feats of this kind were a favorite practice in Irish heroic life, as they were a favorite topic in ancient Irish legend. Their persistence in the more or less rationalized Irish tales that have come down to us is ample proof. They are in fact as characteristic a motif as is that of the fairy mistress. Inevitably the two motifs would be associated; and it is not surprising that their influence is perceptible in mediaeval romance. The arched active bridge which Cuchullin crossed on his way to Scathach's realm is paralleled, as has been pointed out, by the similar bridge in the *Perceval*.³⁹ The latter is supposed to have been left in its strange state by a fairy in commemoration of her dead lover. Doubtless in some earlier version the bridge was crossed by that lover by means of some such feat of jumping as Cuchullin was called on to perform, an exploit impossible for the knightly Perceval, and therefore omitted in the later story. The sword feat lent itself more readily to adaptation in the semi-rationalized sources which Chrêtein must have used, and in that fact we may find the reason for its reappearance in the courtly romance. Centuries after those Irish pagans who sang of it in Caesar's time, perhaps; centuries in which the fairy Otherworld of their wild yet beautiful legends had taken on the composite, semi-rationalized, semi-Christianized character which it has in Chrétien's account of Méléagant's kingdom, all those details were introduced which seem to make easy the equation of the sword and the soul bridge. But it is significant that for all Chrétien's courtliness and mediaeval sophistication, the literalness of the primitive exploit remains in his story.

Two allusions in other stories deserve a final word. As each one fails to account for the relation between the bridge and the Lancelot episode, they seem improbable sources for the sword bridge idea. The first one, which to the writer's knowledge has never been cited in this connection, has the merit of offering a close parallel to the incident of a sword used as a bridge to a place

³⁹ See here, n. 11; also Weston, *Legend of Sir Perceval*, I, 267, who thinks it "most likely that in its original form" the episode of the fairy's bridge "was the subject of an independent *lai*."

that is intended to be an Otherworld kingdom. It is the tale told first, it would seem, by Paul the Deacon in the eighth century in his *De Gestis Langobardorum*. Paul probably heard it at Chalons-sur-Saone, where the story was localized. In brief it is as follows:

The Burgundian king, Guntram, whose capital is at Chalons, goes on a hunting trip. When he happens to be alone with one faithful servant, he is overcome with sleep, and lies down with his head on the servant's knee. Presently a little animal comes from the king's mouth and seeks to cross the stream near by. It is unable to do so until the servant draws his sword and lays it across the stream. The little creature runs across, disappears in a hill, then returns by way of the sword to the king's mouth. The king wakes, tells of a treasure cavern of which he has dreamed, and when the servant in his turn tells of what he has seen, they explore the hill and find there a great treasure. From this the king had a golden canopy made for the shrine of St. Marcellus who was buried in Cabillonum (Chalons). Paul himself saw it there.

In Paul's story the folk-lore element is of an unmistakable kind. The little animal is Guntram's soul, and the sword is literally a soul bridge. F. G. Frazer, *Golden Bough*, Part II, *Taboo*, Lond., 1911, p. 39, 40 and G. Henderson, *Survivals in Belief among the Ancient Celts*, Glasgow, 1911, p. 82, cite references to Gaelic versions of the story which were told in the last century at Loch Shin and Durnoch, Scotland. In each version the marvellous character of the treasure cave is made evident.

Paul's account has as long literary history as that of the soul bridge. It appears in several of the great Chronicles which would certainly have formed a part of the Beauvais library to which we know Chrétien had access (cf. *Cliges*)—providing we wish to believe that the sword bridge was Chrétien's own invention. It is retold in the Chronicles of Regino (d. 915), of Aimon (1008), of Sigebertus (1112), etc.⁴⁰

Another suggestion in explanation of the sword bridge is that hazarded by Miss Paton, *Fairy Mythology*, p. 85. She writes:

"The origin of such a bridge as the *pont de l'épée* is perhaps explained by a passage in *Kilhwch and Olwen* which mentions the

⁴⁰ See Potthast, *Bibliotheca Historica Medii Aevi* for bibliographical information. The writer hopes shortly to publish a study of this tale, noting especially its adaptation into the French *Gui de Warwyke*.

short broad dagger of Berwyn. 'When Arthur and his hosts came before a torrent, they would seek for a narrow place where they might pass the water, and lay a sheathed dagger across the torrent, and it would form a bridge sufficient for the armies of the islands of Britain.' "⁴¹

The difficulty of believing that this one waif of the primitive Welsh story was adopted into an episode in the French tale to which it would otherwise bear not the slightest relation, is enhanced by the character of the dagger itself. It is obviously magical, perhaps mythical, and it may be urged that this very magical quality differentiates the dagger from the sword bridge which, for all its rationalized fairy environment, has something that savours of original realism, of an intention no less straight-forward than was Shakspeare's when he made Worcester promise Hotspur an adventure "as full of peril"

"As to o'erwalk a current roaring loud,
On the unsteadfast footing of a spear."

(*I Henry IV*, I, 3, 192)

LAURA HIBBARD.

MOUNT HOLYOKE COLLEGE.

"Miss Paton's quotation is incorrect. Read as follows, changing Berwyn to "And Osla Gyllellvawr (who bore a short, broad dagger). *Mabinogion*, tr. Lady Guest, Lond., 1877, p. 226; see also H. Zimmer, *Ztschr. f. frz. Spr.*, XII, 231.

OLD SPANISH FUERAS

THE present article, which is offered as a contribution to Spanish lexicography, will treat, principally, of the four following constructions:

1. The use of *fueras* as a preposition.
2. The use of *fueras* as a preposition, but followed by the pronominal *ende*, which frequently had no value whatever.
3. The conjunctive phrase *fueras que*.
4. The conjunctive phrases *fueras si* and *fueras ende si*.

Well-known constructions, such as the purely adverbial *fueras*, *fuera* (also *afuera*), and the old and modern prepositional phrase *fuera de* (in Old Spanish, also *fueras de*), are treated only incidentally and by way of comparison.

For phonetic and semantic reasons it is clear that the Romance forms *fors*, *foras*, *fueras*, etc., are derived from the Latin forms *FÖRIS*, *FÖRÄS*, ablative and accusative plurals, respectively, of an old nominative singular *FÖRA*, = Skr. *dvâr*, Gr. *θύρα*, Eng. *door*, etc. *FÖRIS*, *FÖRÄS* were the older Classic Latin forms. By iambic shortening the final vowels became short very early, so that in Vulgar Latin the forms *FÖRIS*, *FÖRÄS*, were no doubt the forms in common use. In Classic Latin these forms were used only adverbially, with the meanings 'out of doors,' 'without,' 'out,' etc., often equivalent to the adverb *extra*. This adverbial value of *föris*, *föras* was inherited by all the Romance Languages, which continued one or the other of the forms, attributing to the form chosen, however, the more common adverbial value of *föras*, a construction maintained absolutely unchanged from the time of Plautus to the present day.

In Vulgar Latin, however, besides being used as adverbs, the forms *föris*, *föras*, were also commonly used as prepositions, both governing the accusative case, and this prepositional value was also continued by the Romance Languages.¹

¹ See Grandgent, *Vulgar Latin*, §81, Rönsch, *Itala und Vulgata*, 398-399, and Du Cange, III, s. v. Meyer-Lübke, *Gram.* III, §206 and more fully Tobler, *Verm. Beitr.* III, 85-89, treat of the semasiology of the problem involved, which,

The various uses of the derivatives of *fōris*, *fōras* in French, Provençal and Italian, as adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions, etc., are well known to Romance lexicographers, but the Spanish constructions have been only partially studied. Indeed, only the adverbial *fueras* and the prepositional phrase *fuera(s) de* are well known to Spanish grammarians and lexicographers.² The Spanish constructions, therefore, need further investigation.

These will now be studied according to the outline given on page one.³

to be frank, presents no difficulty whatever. No one, to my knowledge, has pointed out, that aside from the natural development of the adverbs into prepositions due to the meanings of the words *fōris*, *fōras*, *per se*, their use side by side with and their association with many other adverbs which had the same or very similar meanings and which in Classic Latin were used also as prepositions, such as *extra*, *praeter*, etc., was perhaps the greatest factor in giving them the double function of adverbs and prepositions.

² The Old French forms and constructions are carefully studied by Tobler, *op. cit.* See also Littré, *s. v.*, and Goddefroy, *s. v.*, who give numerous instances of the various constructions, especially the prepositional value of *fors*, used alone, a construction which has lasted to modern French, whereas in Spanish it did not survive beyond the 13th century. Additional information on the French forms is found in *Zeit. f. Rom. Phil.*, VIII, 256. For the Provençal forms and constructions, see especially, Levy, *Prov. Suppl. Wörterbuch*, III, *s. v.* Most of the various forms and constructions which are found in Old and Modern Italian are given by Tommaseo-Bellini, *Diz.*, II, *s. v.*

The Spanish adverbial *afuera* and *fuera* are treated fully by Cuervo, *Diccionario*, *s. v.* *Afuera* is the result of *ad+foras*, the logical Low Latin construction after a verb of motion. As adverbs both *fuera(s)* and *afuera(s)* occur in Old Spanish, see Menéndez Pidal, *Cantar*, II, *s. v.* The case of the post-positive *fuera(s)*, *afuera(s)*, which may often have a prepositional value, such as, "se abalanzó (por) la puerta *afuera*," etc., is also discussed by Cuervo.

³ The phonology of the problem in Spanish presents no difficulties whatever. The Spanish forms are all derived from *fōras*. The regularly developed Castilian form is *fueras*. It happens that I do not have any cases of the primitive **fuoras*, but I have one case of *fuara* from the text of the *Concilio de León* (Muñoz y Romero, 88). The non-diphthongized forms *foras*, *fora* are also frequent in many Old Spanish documents where one would expect the diphthongized forms. In the *Fuero Jusgo* both forms occur. It may be that, when used as a preposition at least, the word lost its accent through proclisis (cf. French *fors*, Nyrop, *Gram. Hist.*, § 177).

The loss of the final *s* in Spanish was due to analogy, cf. Old Spanish *mientra*, *estonce*, *ante*, *nunqua* by the side of *mientras*, *estonces*, *antes*, *nunquas*, etc. The *s* of *fueras*, *después*, *atrás*, *menos*, *más*, etc, passed to *mientra*, *estonce*, etc., and when the double forms existed side by side, those which originally had final *s* lost it in some cases; see Menéndez Pidal, *Gram. Hist.*, § 128(4).

The Old Spanish forms are, therefore, *fueras*, *fuera*, *foras*, *fora*, **fuoras*,

I. THE PREPOSITION *fueras*

Of those who have recently treated of historical Spanish grammar, Menéndez Pidal barely mentions the Old Spanish prepositional *fueras*,⁴ and Hanssen gives but a single case as if it were a lexicographical curiosity.⁵ In the oldest period of the language, i. e. XIth–XIIIth centuries, the preposition *fueras* was in common and frequent usage. Its meanings were, except, but, besides, outside of, which could also be expressed by many other prepositional forms, especially *excepto*, *salvo*, *sino*, *sacado*, and the prepositional phrase *fuera(s) de* which was also used in Old Spanish.⁶ It was a regular Old Spanish construction just as 'fors' in Old French, which had exactly the same functions. There being, however, so many words which could have the same meaning, and *fueras* itself being in use with the preposition *de*, the old preposition *fueras* was crowded out, and by the beginning of the XIVth century there is absolutely no trace of it. Most of its meanings were expressed by *excepto*, *salvo*, *sino* or *fueras de*. *Fueras*, with the old prepositional force and meaning, survived, therefore, only in the group *fueras de*, which is even to-day a regular construction.⁷

fuara. Only *fueras*, *fuera*, *foras*, *fora*, occur frequently. After the end of the 13th century only *fuera* occurs. The combination with *a < ad*, *afuera*, occurs since the earliest period and this also survives. In Old Spanish, however, this combination is very rare. For the sake of convenience the oldest form, *fueras*, will be used as the type form. In our study of the various constructions which follow, the forms are classified and studied with reference to meaning and function, as *fueras* occurs by the side of *fuera*, *foras*, *fora*.

⁴ *Gram. Hist.*, § 129. In the *Cantar de mio Cid*, the word does not occur as a preposition.

⁵ *Spanische Gram.*, § 73(9).

⁶ The groups *foris de*, *foras de*, were already in use in Vulgar Latin and the Romance Languages, e. g. Spanish, continued such combinations by the side of the prepositional single forms; see Meyer-Lübke, *Gram.*, III, §§ 269, 447.

⁷ In Old French the combination *fors que*, became a regular construction very early (see Tobler, *op. cit.*), although the single *fors* as a preposition is also very frequent, just as the Old Spanish *fueras*. The Old French *fors que* probably developed from the analogy of the numerous constructions of similar meaning which used *que* (see my article in *Matzke Memorial Vol.*, p. 77). In Spanish and also in French the Vulgar Latin group *foras de* was continued as well as the single form. I have found in the *Fuero Juzgo*, however, one case of Spanish *fueras que*, a construction identical with the Old French, 156 b: "... assi que en aquellos treinta dias non coman condocho, nen beban vino, *fueras que* á ora de *vesperas*." The Latin text reads: "excepto vespertinis horis." The *fueras que* could have been rendered here by *fueras*, *sinon*, *excepto*, *salvo*.

The old preposition *fueras* was used to modify or limit either a negation or an affirmation. Examples follow. The other Old Spanish form or forms which could express exactly the same meaning are given in each case.

A. A general negation is modified or limited.

‘Asas se cleressia quanto me es menester,
fueras tu, no ave ome que me pudies vençer;’

[*Alixandre*, ed. M-F., 38 ab]

excepto, sinon.⁸

‘oy ha de ser el dia que lo as a prouar,
fueras dios, non es ome que te pueda prestar,’ . . .

[*Ibid.*, 1668 bc]

fueras de, sinon, excepto.

‘ca avje á toda Asia a su poder tornada,
fueras toda India non le fincaua nada.’

[*Ibid.*, 1924 cd]

fueras de, excepto.

‘los de los elefantes, fuera los ballesteros,
los otros nol valien a Poro todos sendos dineros.’

[*Ibid.*, 2040 cd]

fueras de, excepto,⁹ salvo.⁹

‘Tras unas altas sierras, Caspias son llamadas,
que fueras un portillo non avje mas entradas.’

[*Ibid.*, 2080 ab]

fueras de, excepto, salvo.

‘que, fuera por buen prescio, non daba Ren por al.

[*Ibid.*, 2163 d]

excepto, salvo, sinon.

‘de los Regnos de Asia non le fincaua nada,
fueras una çibdat que estaua alçada.’

[*Ibid.*, 2195 cd]

excepto, fuera de, sinon.

⁸ *Fuera de* could not have been followed by the nominative case. Cf., *Alixandre*, 42 c: ‘non ha fueras de ti mejor nin tal.’

⁹ *Excepto* was in origin a participle which could agree in gender and number with the following substantive, but soon became an indeclinable adjective and then a preposition. *Salvo* was likewise a participial adjective in Old Spanish and could be inflected. Both govern the nominative case. See Bello-Cuervo, *Gram.*, §§ 1186, 1187.

‘Non es qui la podiesse qual era perçebir,
Fuera qui la podiesse en si mismo sofrir.’

[*San Millán*, 55 cd]

excepto, sinon.

‘Non sabien en la cosa nul consejo tomar,
Fuera ir á los montes otra viga buscar.’

[*Ibid.*, 233 cd]

excepto, sinon.

‘Nin es omne nin angel nin otra criatura,
Fuera Dios que lo faze por la su grant mesura.’

[*Sacrificio*, 167 ab]

excepto, salvo, sinon, fuera de.

‘et non esca [fora] per ellos foras á meanedo.’

[*Fuero de Avilés* (Fernández-Guerra), 20]

‘et non exa por ellos foras amezanedo.’

[*F. de Oviedo*, *ibid.*]

‘. . . con que los mato a todos assi que no
finco dellos fueras Noe e su mugier e tres sos hijos:’

[*Pr. Crónica Gen.* (Pidal), 4 b, 35-36]

excepto, sinon, fuera de.

‘et nunqua sea comungado, foras á¹⁰ sua morte,’ . . .

[*Fuero Juzgo* (Academy ed. 1815), XI a]

excepto, sinon.

Latin text: *praeter*.

‘que la muier non pueda ende aver nada, fueras
lo quel diere por amor.’

[*Ibid.*, 82 b]

excepto, fuera de, sinon.

Latin text: *excepto*.

‘E si non ovieren otra cosa fueras tierras ó siervos,’ . . .

[*Ibid.*, 194 a 6]

excepto, sinon.

Latin text: *praeter*.

¹⁰ All the cases where *fueras* is followed by a subordinate preposition I have classified with *fueras* as a preposition, since the subordinate preposition does not alter the character of *fueras* in the least.

'e que non tengan en los corazones al, fúeras
lo que dicen por la boca,' . . .

[*Ibid.*, 194 a]

excepto, salvo, sinon.^{10a}

'E otrosi dezimos, que los siervos de nuestra corte non puedan
vender sus siervos, nin heredade á nengunos omnes libres, fúeras á
los otros nuestros siervos,'

[*Ibid.*, 98 a]

excepto, sinon.

Latin text: nisi tantummodo.

'Otrosi, todo omme que oviere casas en la Villa, e las toviere
pobladas, non peche ninguna cosa, fuera en los muros e en las torres
de nuestro término.'

[*Fuero de Sepúlveda* (Calleja, 1857), Tit. IX]

excepto, sinon.

'Otrosi, deben guardar que non judguen en los logares que an
de poder judgar á ome de otra parte aquien demandan antellos,
fúeras en estas cosas sennaladas' . . .

[*Memorial Hist. Español*, I, 140]

B. A general affirmation is modified or limited.

' fuera los que estauan en la torre alcados
todos jazien en fierros e en sogas atados.'

[*Alixandre*, 1565 cd]

fuera de, excepto, sinon.¹¹

' por Padre lo catauan, essi sancto conceio,
fúera¹² algunt maliello, que ualia poquilleio.'

¹² Var. *foras*.

[*St. Domingo* (ed. Fitz-Gerald), 92 cd]

'Otrosi, si qui granas cogiere con cuchillo ó con foz, ó en otra
guisa, fuera con una mano, peche un mri.'

[*Fuero de Sepul.*, *op. cit.*, Tit. CXXVI]

excepto, salvo, sinon.

' et en esto todo ponga el yuvero todo lo que fuere menester,
fúera la madera que ponga el señor.'

[*Ibid.*, CXXXII]

fuera de, excepto, sinon.

^{10a} Where no Latin text is given, the Latin construction is entirely different.

¹¹ *Sinon* was not as common in affirmative as in negative sentences, but
before the XVIth century it was quite frequent, see *Matzke Mem. Vol. op.*
cit., pages 91-92.

‘quantos ovieren destos á sacar, sáquenles de todo pecho, fuera moneda.’

[*Ibid.*, CXCIX]

excepto, fuera de, salvo, sinon.

‘toda la pena e tod el damno que deve aver el forzador, todo lo an a aver los hermanos fúeras muerte.’

[*Fuero Juzgo*, 53 a]

excepto, salvo, sinon.

Latin text: excepta morte.

‘aquesta debe ser metida en poder de la primera muier, que faga della lo que quisiere, fúeras muerte.’

[*Ibid.*, 64 a]

excepto, sinon.¹⁸

Latin text: vita tantum concessa.

‘que todo esto sea en voluntad de los fíos lo que quisieren ende tomar, fúeras lo que reciben dalgunos estrannos.’ . . .

[*Ibid.*, 77 b, 25-27]

excepto, fuera de, salvo, sinon.

Latin text: excepto id quod.

‘mas dévelo meter en poder de los parientes mas propincos del muerto, que fagan dél lo que quisieren, fúeras muerte.’

[*Ibid.*, 117 a]

excepto, sinon, salvo (variant).

Latin text: excepto.

‘Et todo quanto vos pudieredes aver de nuestra heredad o de otra part, fúeras vuestra heredad, todo lealmiente sea empleado en pro.’ . . .

[*Chartes de l'Abbaye de Silos* (ed. Ferotin), 207, 20-22]
fuera de, excepto, salvo, sinon.

‘Et nos mandamos á los caballeros et á los omes buenos de Toledo, que los diessen posadas, las mejores que pudiesen aver, fuera aquellas en que ellos moraban;’

[*Mem. Hist. Esp.*, *op. cit.*, I, 155]

excepto, fuera de, salvo.

‘Et si el Rey de Leon ficer fer omenaxe de su Regno ad algun otro omne fora á suo filio,’ . . .

[*Tratados de paz, Alfonso VIII de Castilla y Alfonso IX de Leon, año 1206; España Sagrada XXXV, Appendix, CXXXV*]
excepto, salvo, sinon.

¹⁸ Cf. 64 b: ‘esta mujer pecador sea metuda en poder dellos, que fagan della lo que quisieren, si non muerte.’

'Et debense ayudar sobre todos los omnes del mundo, assi moros como christianos, foras el Rey de Aragon, et el Rey de França.'

[*Ibid.*, CXXXVI]
excepto, salvo, sinon.

Contrary to the general rule of the position of *fueras* as exemplified in all the previous cases, *fueras* as a preposition could also be placed at the very end of the sentence, after the object which it governed:

'E porque el oficio del Dean es más honrado, e mayor que el de los otros comunamente en las mas eglesias, el obispo fuera.'

[*Siete Partidas* (ed. Lopez, 1843-4), I, VI, 3]

The case which Old Spanish *fueras* governed, when used as a preposition, cannot be easily determined. Of all the cases which I have found, only one case, the first one of those given above, can be of any value, where we have a pronominal form which remains in the nominative case. Pietsch (*Mod. Phil.*, II, 221) gives two more cases. These cases, however, cannot settle the question. In Vulgar Latin, *foras, foris*, governed the accusative and this must have been the rule in the very beginning both in Old Spanish and Old French.¹⁴ In Old French the objective case was commonly used after *fors*, but by attraction to the subject of the verb of the principal clause, *fors* could also be followed by the nominative case, as was the case with *praeter* in Latin.¹⁵ In Spanish the case may have been the same, but the nominative form in question may also be due to the analogy of *excepto, salvo, sinon*, which always governed the nominative.

The prepositional phrase *fueras de* dates from Vulgar Latin and is also frequent in Old Spanish by the side of *fueras* and practically with the same meanings, as is evident from all the previous examples, where *fueras de* could substitute *fueras* in most cases. No examples need to be given of this common construction which still lives in Spanish. With the meaning, outside of, from, away from,

¹⁴ The cases which I have found for the Latin of Spain are all in harmony with this general rule. A few examples from *España Sagrada* are: *foras I. corte*, XXXVI, xxxviii; *foras una*, Ib. xlvi; *foris illum cotum*, XXXVII, 34; *foras istos terminos*, Ib. 319; *foris autem montes*, 2b. 325; *foras Ecclesiam*, Ib. 349.

¹⁵ Tobler, *op. cit.*, 86-88.

as in, 'por la locura que fezo deve seer echado fuera de la tierra por siempre' [*Fuero Juzgo*, 114 b], and 'ye á estos fuara del mercado peche LX soldos' . . . [Muñoz y Romero, *op. cit.*, 88], where no limitation is in any way implied, and where *fueras de* cannot be substituted by *salvo*, *excepto*, *sinon*, *fueras* alone does not seem to be used. The group *de fueras*, however, may be used with such meaning:

'Nullius homine qui sacar' armas esmoludas vel espadas nudas, de fora manta, contra suo vecino, . . .

[*Fuero de Avilés*, 14]

'Nullo omme que sacar armas esmoludas ó espada nuda de ffora manto, contra su vezino.'

[*Fuero de Oviedo*, *ibid.*]

In Old Spanish and also in Old French, the limiting expressions *sinon*, *fueras*, *fors que*, etc., were very frequently strengthened by one or more adverbs, such as *sólo*, *solamente*, *tanto*, *tan solamente*, etc.¹⁶

When such an adverb was used with the group *fueras de*, it could be placed between *fueras* and *de*:

'nos non queremos fablar de los otros linages, fueras solamente de los hijos de Japhet,' . . .

[*Primera Cr. Gen.*, 5 a]

2. *Fueras ende* (*end*, *en*).

The Latin locative adverb *inde* developed in Vulgar Latin into an indefinite pronoun or a pronominal adverb.¹⁷ In Old Spanish, its ordinary meanings as a pronominal adverb were, *de ello*, *de eso*, *por eso*, *por ello*, *en ello*, etc. Frequently the indefinite pronoun force was also extended into a partitive genitive with the force of a relative, a very common construction in Old Spanish. In this last use the meanings of Old Spanish *ende*, *end*, *en*, were, *de él*, *ella*, *ellos*, *ellas*, *eso*, *ello*, etc.¹⁸

¹⁶ See Matzke *Mem. Vol.*, *op. cit.*, 86-87. Cf., also, *fueras tanto que*, in 3.

¹⁷ See Grandgent, *Vulgar Latin*, §§ 60, 71, 384; Menéndez Pidal, *Cantar I*, § 134; Meyer-Lübke, *Gram. III*, § 64(3).

¹⁸ Hanssen (*Span. Gram.*, § 58(3)) gives a full and clear account of the meanings and uses of Old Spanish *ende*, *end*, *en*. The phonetic processes involved in the shortened forms are also explained in § 15(2).

The use of the partitive genitive *ende* after a limiting preposition or adverb was very frequent in Old Spanish, as one would naturally expect. In the sentence, '*compró las casas, excepto las muy viejas*,' it would be very natural to add '*de ellas*.' This was done in Old Spanish by the use of the partitive genitive *ende* (*end, en*) placed immediately after the limiting preposition or adverb. The idea in question was expressed by *salvo ende, excepto ende, fueras ende*.

However, the frequent use of *ende* in this construction gave rise to its use after *fueras* even in cases where it had no meaning whatever. *Fueras ende* came to be looked upon as a unity and became of frequent use as a preposition equivalent to *fueras*, *ende* having no value whatever. The origin of *fueras ende* (*end, en*), as the equivalent of the preposition *fueras*, therefore, is to be found in the construction where *ende* had its independent function as a partitive genitive. Examples of both constructions follow.

A. The preposition *fueras*, followed by *ende* with the independent function of a partitive genitive pronoun.

The question of *ende* aside, the following examples belong in the same category with those in I., already treated. The cases where *fueras* is used to limit or modify a general negation are given first as in I.

(a) 'Nengun omne non ose casar ni ensuciar por adulterio con la esposa de su padre, ó con alguna que fué su mugier . . . ó con parienta de su mulier fasta VI. grado, fueras ende¹⁹ aquellas personas que eran ya ayuntadas por mandado del príncipe.' . . .

[*Fuero Juzgo*, 60 a]

Latin text: *exceptis illis personis.*

'Iuro por el que juzgó con derecho que non entrasse nenguno de los hijos de Israel en la tierra de la promisión, porque non croyeron por su palabra, fueras end Josue Ben Non, é Caleb, los cuales juzgó que entrarien hy.'

[*Ibid.*, 197 b, end.]

Latin text: *excepto.*²⁰

'Ya auie toda Asia a su poder tornada,
Fueras end toda India nol ficaua al nada.'

[*Alixandre* (ed. Janer), 1783 cd]

¹⁹ Variant, *en*.

²⁰ A preposition. It was so used in Vulgar Latin although its adjectival value developed early and is found in the early period of the Romance Languages.

(b) 'e mandolos a todos uender, fueras ende los mayorales que non quiso equalallos con los otros;'

[*Pr. Crónica Gen.*, 50 b, 10-12]

'et el aver que perdieren los fiadores, sea todo de los parientes del muerto, que lo ovieren de eredar, fuera ende los cien mrs. de omeclio.' . . .

[*Fuero de Sepul.*, *op. cit.*, Tit XLVII]

'Et de las otras cosas faga el príncipe lo que quiser, et délas a quien quiser, foras ende aquellas cosas que avia el Rey Don Cistasundo.'

[*Fuero Juzgo*, VI b]

Latin text: illis tantumdem exemptis.

'E pues que esto ovieren complido aquellos testigos, deven aver la vicesima parte de los dineros del muerto, e non de las otras cosas, por su trabaio, fueras ende las cartas de las debdas,' . . .

[*Ibid.*, 41 b]

'mas los fios ayan toda la buena de su padre, fueras ende la quinta parte que puede dar por su alma a quien quisiere.'

[*Ibid.*, 73 a]

'Onde por esta ley avemos dado conseio á todos los huérfanos, fueras ende aquellos que son de tal edad, que pues que an XV annos passados.' . . .

[*Ibid.*, 75 b]

'é assi non sea tenudo de pagar ende nada, fueras ende el oro ó la plata que non puede arder.'

[*Ibid.*, 91 a]

Latin text: excepto auro et argento.

The above group, preposition *fueras* + *ende* with the function of a partitive genitive pronoun, was current in Vulgar Latin, and is frequent in the Low Latin documents of Spain, e. g.:

"In Tano medios filios de Pelagio Martiniz, . . . et fillos et neptos de Martino Saciniz de Quintes, foras inde Petro Martiniz et illos casseros ambos cum filiis, . . .

'Et in valle de Carrenio Santa Marta cum sua hereditate integra foras inde illa tercia quae debet et tenet Munius Martiniz et sua mulier in vita sua,' . . .

[Muñoz y Romero, *Col. Fueros Municip.* (Madrid, 1847), 162]

B. The preposition *fueras* followed by *ende*, the latter with no value whatever. The group *fueras ende* is equivalent to *fueras* alone.

‘La testimonia del siervo non deve seer creyda . . . ; fueras ende los siervos que son del servicio del rey.’

[*Fuero Juzgo*, 34 b]

Latin text: exceptis servis nostris.

‘El omne franqueado ó la muier franqueada non pueden seer contra nengun omne testimonio, fueras ende en el pleyto que non puede aver omne libre.’ . . .

[*Ibid.*, 96 b]

Latin text: excepto in.

‘Nengun omne non meta fisico en cárcel, maguer que non seya conocido, fueras ende por omecillo.’

[*Ibid.*, 172 b]

Latin text: excepta homicidii causa.

3. THE CONJUNCTIVE PHRASE *fueras que*.

When a new clause is introduced as the limiting idea to a general affirmation or negation, the preposition *fueras* is followed by the conjunction *que*. This conjunctive group is equivalent to *sinon que*, *salvo que*, *excepto que*²¹ and to the Old French conjunctive *fors que*.²² Examples:

‘que non es nuestro seso si non figuridat,
fueras que nos contiene dios por su piedat.’

[*Alixandre*, 968 cd]

‘non sabie el mezquino otra cosa pedir,
fueras que le dennase Dios los oios abrir.’

[*Sto Domingo*, 346 cd]

‘mas rancar non podieron puerro nñ chirivja,
fueras que barbecharon lo que yasia eria.’

[*Ibid.*, 378 cd]

‘E si el quereloso esto non pudier provar por testimonias, quel iuez lo fiz por enganno, . . . é sea quito, fueras tanto que²³ el iuez puede dos dias . . . folgar en su casa,’ . . .

[*Fuero Juzgo*, 17 b]

²¹ Hanssen, *Spanische Gram.* § 62(13); Meyer-Lübke, *Gram.*, III, § 615.

²² Tobler, *op. cit.*, 88.

²³ Variant: *salvo tanto que*. *Tanto* is frequently used here. See *Matzke Mem. Vol.*, 86-87.

‘¿ qual cosa esperamos de la crianza fueras que aquellos que an á nacer ó non semejarán al padre ni á la madre, ó serán de dos formas?’²⁴

[*Ibid.*, 47 a]

Latin text: *nisi ut.*

‘E assi esto mandamos guardar de los que son de orden, que non mandan casar los decretos, fueras que tiramos desta ley las muieres que casaron por fuerza,’ . . .

[*Ibid.*, 61 a]

4. THE CONJUNCTIVE PHRASES

fueras si AND *fueras ende si*.

The preposition *fueras* followed by the conjunction *si*, ‘if,’ developed in Old Spanish into a fixed phrase, a conjunctive phrase of a conditional and relative character, equivalent, as a rule, to *excepto que*, *excepto en caso que*, *excepto cuando*, *salvo que*, etc., *fueras que*, and the modern Spanish *á no ser que*,²⁵ English, unless, unless it be that. The conjunctive phrase *fueras si* was of a very wide use in Old Spanish. From the very common use of the prepositional *fueras ende*, where *ende* was in some cases a partitive genitive pronoun or had no value whatever, *ende* also appears in our present phrase, so that *fueras ende si* is used by the side of *fueras si* and with exactly the same meaning. In the conjunctive phrase, *fueras ende si*, therefore, *ende* has never any value. Examples of these constructions follow.

A. *Fueras si*.

‘ca los pleitos do se comienzan alli se deben acabar, fueras si el Rey los manda librar en su corte.’

[*Memorial Hist. Esp.*, I, 141]

‘Otrosi, todo caballero de Sepulvega que pró toviere de senñor, é fuerre con él en la hueste, aya todos sus derechos en Sepulvega, fueras si fuere con su senñor en deservicio del Rey,’ . . .

[*Fuero de Sepil.*, Tit. LXXVII]

²⁴ In questions such as this, *si non* has always been used in Spanish and to a certain extent, in French, Portuguese and Italian. See *Matzke Mem. Vol.* 89-90.

²⁵ Only *á no ser que* and the Old Spanish phrases *sinon si*, *fueras cuando*, can always be exact equivalents. *Fueras que*, *excepto que*, *salvo que* (see 3) introduced a limiting idea and were rarely conditional.

‘Hye ponemos que todo onme que reffugar el dinero foras si for falssso ho britado’ . . .

[*Ayuntamiento de Oviedo, Colección* (Vigil, 1889), 48 a]

‘nin sea constrennido en estos dias, fueras si era el pleyto ante comenzado.’

[*Fuero Juzgo*, 136]

Latin text: nisi forte.

‘ni mande ni constringa por sí, ni por sayon, fueras si fuere juez de mandado del rey,’ . . .

[*Ibid.*, 15 b]

Latin text: nisi.

‘E todos los otros siervos de nuestra corte non devén seer creydos en testimonia, fueras si lo mandare el rey.’

[*Ibid.*, 34 b]

Latin text: nisi.

‘non damos ende poder á todo omne, fueras si fuere el pecado muy manifiesto,’ . . .

[*Ibid.*, 59 b]

Latin text: nisi aut.

‘establecemos que aquel que nasce non deve aver la buena de los padres, fueras si²⁶ depues que fuere nascido recibiere baptismo,’ . . .

[*Ibid.*, 72 a]²⁷

Latin text: nisi.

‘Nul omme que prender fueras sis rrancurar al M. o al sagione. pectet: lx^a. ssuellos al M. et torné la prenda.’

[*Fuero de Oviedo* (F-Guerra.), 17]

B. *Fueras ende si.*

‘Emperador ó Rey puede facer leyes sobre las gentes de su Señorio é otro ninguno no ha poder de las facer en lo temporal, fueras ende si lo ficiesen con otorgamiento dellos.’

[*Siete Partidas*, I, I, 12]

‘Desatadas non deben ser las leyes, por ninguna manera, fueras ende si ellas non fuesen tales, que desatasen el bien que debían facer.’

[*Ibid.*, I, I, 18]

‘fueras ende si el caballero ficiese traición ó falsoedad, ó aleve, ó yerro, . . . no se puede escusar que non haya la pena que las leyes mandan.’

[*Ibid.*, I, I, 21]

‘mas aquel que face el pecado lo debe decir por su boca, fueras ende si non sopiese el lenguage de aquel, á quien se debe confesar.’

...

[*Ibid.*, I, IV, 30]

²⁶ Variant: *salvo si*.

²⁷ Other cases: 76b, 77b, 86a, 132b, etc.

‘Et decimos otro si, que si muchos querellosos vinieren antellos por razonar el pleyto que deben oir . . . fueras ende si fuere pleyto que fuere comenzado.’

[*Mem. Hist. Esp.*, I, 143]

‘e que non sea fecho en barragana; fuera ende si fuere fecho fijo por concejo,’ . . .

[*Fuero de Sepúl.*, Tit LXII]

‘Nengun omne non se puede defender, que non responda al que se querella dél, . . . fueras ende si²⁸ se pudiere defender,’ . . .

[*Fuero Juzgo*, 24 a]

Latin text: excepto si.

‘el siervo non se puede querellar del omne libre, nil puede demandar nada, fueras ende si el señor non puede venir al pleyto por si mismo,’ . . .

Latin text: nisi forte.

[*Ibid.*, 29 a]

‘non mandamos que tal persona sea metida en tormentos, . . . fueras ende si aquel que mete el personero,’ . . .

[*Ibid.*, 30 b]²⁹

With exactly the same meaning as *fueras (ende) si*, may be used also *fueras (ende) cuando*

‘non se le perdonan los pecados per el Baptismo: fueras ende quando tuelle aquel engaño de su corazón.’

[*Siete Partidas*, I, IV, 5]

‘Nunqua dias nin noches sin olio non estaba,
Fueru quando el ministro la mecha li cambiaba.’

[*San Millán*, 331 cd]

Exact equivalents of *fueras ende si* were not of very frequent use in Old Spanish. Besides those already mentioned, the adverbial phrases *salvo (ende) si* and *si non si*, were also in use.

‘Otrosi, todo sobrino de caballero, ó pariente que con él morare, non peche fonsadera ninguna, salvo ende si fuere casado.’

[*Fuero de Sepúl.*, Tit. CCXL]

‘Ningún fisico non deve sangrar ni melecinar muger libre, . . . fueras ende si³⁰ la dolor le acoitare mucho.’

[*Fuero Juzgo*, 171 ab]

Latin text: excepto si.

²⁸ Variant: *salvo si*.

²⁹ Other cases: 35a, 36b, 37b, 40b, 48b, etc.

³⁰ Variant: *salvo ende si*. Cf., also, 24a, 72a, etc.

'que si algun judío ó alguna judía se quisiere casar primero casamiento, non se case si non si diere arras sabudas,' . . .

[*Ibid.*, 191 b]

'ca d'otra guisa non se devén someter los siervos cristianos en su servicio, nin seer en su poder, si non si fuere provado que son verdaderos,' . . .

[*Ibid.*, 194 b]

Latin text: *nisi*.

An adverbial phrase may come between *si non* and *si* (cf. *fueras solamente de*, 1, end.):

'Nengun judío desde el primer anno que regnamos . . . non sea osado de se apoderar . . . si non por ventura si les mandare el rey recabdar algunas cosas.'

[*Fuero Juzgo*, 199 a]

Latin text: *excepto si*.

It should be noted that the most common verb form which occurs in the clause introduced by *fueras (ende) si, si non si, salvo (ende) si*, is the future subjunctive, and in the Latin text, the future perfect indicative, from which the Spanish future subjunctive is derived. In such cases the Latin text usually has *nisi* or *excepto si*, the last a Vulgar Latin construction. The Old Spanish future subjunctive, however, had frequently its primary and original meaning, i. e., the force of a future indicative as well as of a subjunctive. Both in Old and Modern Spanish, the present indicative may in most cases be used as a substitute.

AURELIO M. ESPINOSA.

LELAND STANFORD JUNIOR UNIVERSITY.

SUAREZ DE FIGUEROA'S *ESPAÑA DEFENDIDA* AND TASSO'S *GERUSALEMME LIBERATA*

Of all the literary forms which attained their highest development in Spain of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the epic alone offers little of permanent value. While the drama, novel, short story and lyric poetry were cultivated with success and with considerable originality, the epic poets were content to translate and imitate foreign models. The influence of Ariosto was dominant in the epic until about the year 1600 and the position of honor was accorded to Tasso throughout the first half of the following century. As Farinelli has said: "Non v'era poeta in Ispagna ai primi del '600 che non avesse succhiato in gioventù il dolce miele delle rime del Tasso."¹ This influence is attested, not only by the translations of the *Gerusalemme Liberata* by Bartolomé Cayrasco de Figueroa, Juan Sedeño and Antonio Sarmiento de Mendoza, but especially by the many epics composed under the inspiration of Tasso and with the evident desire to rival the master. It is true that many of these imitations have little literary value. They adopted the framework of their model, flagrantly plagiarized the descriptions and figures of speech and divested it of all its poetry and beauty.

Cristóbal Suárez de Figueroa was one of the most fervent admirers of Tasso in Spain. We know that he went to Italy in 1588, at the age of seventeen and remained there until 1604. During this period he became interested in Italian letters, and in 1609 published a Spanish version of Guarini's *Pastor Fido*,² which was justly praised by Cervantes in *Don Quixote*.

¹ See his article published in the *Rassegna bibliografica della letteratura italiana*, Vol. III, p. 238 ff. entitled, *La più antica versione spagnuola della Gerusalemme del Tasso*, in which he mentions a number of translations and imitations of Tasso.

² It has not been definitely settled whether the Cristóbal Suárez who published a version of the *Pastor Fido* at Naples in 1602 is the same as Cristóbal Suárez de Figueroa. The question is discussed in my monograph on Suárez de Figueroa, Philadelphia, 1907, 24-28. See also the notes of Señor Cortés to the Spanish translation of the same, Valladolid, 1911, p. 26.

In 1609 Figueroa entered the service of Don Juan Hurtado de Mendoza, whose marriage with Doña María de Cárdenas he had celebrated in *La Constante Amarilis*, and to this nobleman he dedicated his epic poem, *España Defendida*, which was published at Madrid in 1612. In the prologue, he acknowledges his indebtedness to Tasso. "A éste pues, insigne en los requisitos apuntados, imité en esta obra, y con tanto rigor en parte de la traza, y en dos, ó tres lugares de la batalla entre Orlando y Bernardo, que casi se puede llamar version de la de Tancredo y Argante: supuesto me valí hasta de sus mismas comparaciones (téngase desde luego cuenta con esto, no imagine el censor, se pretende encubrir, ó passar de falso este, que él llamará hurto) y ojalá tuviera yo talento para trasladarle todo en nuestra lengua con la misma elegancia, y enfasi, que suena en la suya, que entendiera lisongearla con semejante ocupacion." When an author affirms so frankly his imitation, he disarms criticism and censure. A comparison of the two poems will show, however, that Figueroa's indebtedness is far greater than he acknowledges, and also will serve as a chapter in the account, which is yet to be written, of the influence of Tasso upon Spanish literature.

The poem is divided into fourteen books in octaves, and relates the victory of the Spaniards, led by Bernardo del Carpio, over Charlemagne and the invading French army at the battle of Roncevaux.³ The argument of the poem, in brief, is as follows. Alfonso the Chaste, being old and without heirs, agrees to present his crown to Charlemagne, an offer which the latter readily accepts. The Spanish nobles, however, resent this intrusion by a foreigner and annul the King's pact. Charlemagne insists that the agreement be fulfilled and after waiting five years, sends Roland and Archbishop Turpin to demand the crown in his behalf. When the proposals of

³ The story of Bernardo del Carpio is a curious example of the way an old story is changed to meet the peculiar requirements of a nation. The account of Charlemagne's invasion of Spain, as given in the *Chanson de Roland*, hurt the national pride of the Spaniards, and to offset this they composed their own version, according to which Roland was defeated in single combat by Bernardo del Carpio, the champion of the Asturian army, when on the point of entering Spain. Señor Menéndez y Pelayo has studied the story in the introduction to Lope de Vega's comedias, *Las Mocedades de Bernardo del Carpio* and *El Casamiento en la muerte*, in the Spanish Academy's edition of the works of Lope de Vega, Vol. VII.

the ambassadors are declined by the Spaniards, they retire with threats of war. The Spanish army, led by Bernardo del Carpio and aided by the Moors, defeats the invading army at Roncevaux, and Bernardo kills the mighty Roland in single combat.

BOOK I

After the opening stanza and invocation to the Muse in the conventional epic tone, we have a description of the council in which Alfonso and his nobles hear the message sent by Charlemagne, urging him to comply with his promise to abdicate. This corresponds to the council in which Alete and Argante appear before Goffredo. Argante corresponds to Orlando.

E. D., stanza 7:

Hizo en entrando humilde reuerencia
Turpin al Rey; mas la persona osada
del Par Orlando armada de entereza,
inclinó casi nada la cabeza.

G. L. II, stanzas 60-61:

Picciol segno d'onor gli fece Argante,
in guisa pur d'uom grande e non curante.
Ma la destra si pose Alete al seno,
e chinò il capo, e piegò a terra i lumi.

In E. D., 8-24, Turpin urges Alfonso to fulfill his promise to Charlemagne and warns him not to trust the Moors. In like manner, Alete urges Goffredo to desist from the war and bids him not to trust the Greeks, G. L. II, 62-79. The vassals show displeasure at the proposals, E. D., 25 and G. L. II, 80. Alfonso, in gentle tone, declares the reasons for his refusal to accept their propositions, E. D., 26-33 as Goffredo in G. L. II, 81-87. The impetuous Orlando springs to his feet and challenges them all to mortal combat, as Argante in the *Gerusalemme*.

E. D., 36-37:

En suma, guerra, y paz teneys delante,
sepa qual de las dos mas os agrada?
Guerra (dixeron todos al instante)
aqui la guerra sola es aceptada.

Apenas esto, quando el prouocante
terció la capa, y empuñó la espada,
diziendo con mayor corage, y brio:
Pues á guerra mortal os desafio.

Quien desprecia la paz, aya la guerra,
que jamas huuo falta de renzillas:
yo solo pondré fuego á vuestra tierra;
y assolaré yo solo vuestras villas.

G. L. II, 88-90:

"Chi la pace non vuol, la guerra s'abbia,
ché penuria già mai non fu di risse;
e ben la pace ricusar tu mostri,
se non t'acqueti a i primi detti nostri."

"O sprezzator de le piú dubbie imprese,
e guerra e pace in questo sen t'apporto;
tua sia l'elezione: or ti consiglia
senz'altro indugio, e qual piú vuoi ti piglia."

L'atto fero e'l parlar tutti commosse
a chiamar guerra in un concorde grido,
non attendendo che risposto fosse
dal magnanimo lor duce Goffrido.
Spiegò quel crudo il seno; e'l manto scosse,
ed "A guerra mortal" disse "vi sfido."

Alfonso and Goffredo show the same gentleness in dismissing the bold messengers, E. D., 39 and G. L. II, 92. The remainder of Book I is devoted to a description of a boar hunt in which Bernardo takes part. Bermudo arrives with letters from the King, asking him to lead the Asturians in the approaching war with France. Bernardo refuses to obey, alleging the injustice and cruelty which Alfonso had shown to his parents and to himself.

BOOK II

Book II relates the arrival of the Englishman Ricardo with his fleet to the shores of Galicia after a furious storm. Ricardo meets the shepherd Damon who tells of his misfortunes and sings in praise of the life of solitude. It will be remembered that Figueroa's

poetical name was Damon and part of the account is unquestionably autobiographical, but was doubtless suggested by the conversation of the old shepherd with Erminia in G. L. VII, 8-13.

Book III

Book III opens with a council of devils in which Pluto advises his subjects to defeat the purposes of Charlemagne so that the Moors may have an easy victory later over the Spaniards. The description of the council is almost a literal translation of the *Gerusalemme*, IV, 1-18.

E. D., 2-3:

Ya el ronco son de la Tartarea trompa
llama los tenebrosos moradores.
Manda Pluton, quel ayre negro rompa
qualquier executor de sus furores:
Horrida magestad, horrida pompa
(miserable consuelo en sus ardores)
su espiritu feroz adquiere, en tanto,
que se conuoca el Reyno del espanto.

Las profundas cauernas retemblaron,
compelidas del impetu imperante;
y las puertas de Auerno se encontraron,
rompiendo sus cerrojos de diamante:
Con tan fiero estampido no aterraron
los furibundos rayos del Tonante,
en Flegra la terrible osada gente,
como el Herebo en sus entrañas siente.

G. L. IV, 3:

Chiama gli abitator de l'ombre eterne
il rauco suon de la tartarea tromba.
Tremen le spaziose atre caverne,
e l'aer cieco a quel romor rimbomba:
né sì stridendo mai da le superne
regioni del cielo il folgor piomba,
né sì scossa giammai trema la terra
quando i vapori in sen gravida serra.

The hosts of Hell assemble.

E. D., 5:

Espantosos Centauros, y Gorgones,
 brotando estan abominables quiebras;
 Polifemos, Quimeras, Geriones,
 con diademas de Esfinges, y culebras:
 mil Hidras, mil Arpias, mil Pitones,
 por donde el Sol jamas tendio sus hebras
 corren, y entre ellos con atrozes rostros,
 otras varias visiones, varios mostros.

G. L. IV, 5:

Qui mille immonde arpie vedresti e mille
 Centauri e Sfingi e pallide Gorgoni;
 molte e molte latrar voraci Scille,
 e fischiare Idrè, e sibilare Pitoni,
 e vomitar Chimere atre faville;
 e Polifemi orrendi e Gerioni;
 e in novi mostri, e non più intesi o visti,
 diversi aspetti in un confusi e misti.

Stanzas 12-21 contain a diatribe on contemporary conditions, in which Figueroa bitterly attacks those in authority. Pluto then narrates the history of Spain, telling the evil which the Devil had wrought since the sin of Rodrigo. He bids his subjects to assemble the hosts of Islam, and the devils set about to carry out the orders of their chief.

E. D., 40:

Al fin de aquel acento prodigioso,
 que de nuevo terror á Dite llena,
 parte todo vestiglo pressuroso,
 á executar lo que su rey ordena.
 Escureciendo el ayre luminoso,
 va con el ala vil que horrible suena,
 y en forma yugal, á platicar sus artes,
 acuden todos por diuersas partes.

This corresponds to G. L. IV, 18:

Non aspettar già l'alme a Dio rubelle
 che fosser queste voci al fin condotte;
 ma fuor volando a riveder le stelle
 già se n'uscian da la profonda notte,

come sonanti e turbide procelle,
che vengan fuor de le natie lor grotte
ad oscurar il cielo, a portar guerra
a i gran regni del mare e de la terra.

In the last part of Book III, the allegorical figure of Castidad appears in a vision to Alfonso and tells him of those who will succeed him on the throne of Spain, ending with a eulogy of Philip IV. This description is doubtless a reminiscence of Peter the Hermit's prophecy concerning Rinaldo and the future glories of the House of Este, contained in Canto X of the *Gerusalemme Liberata*.

BOOK IV

The review of the French troops with which the book opens corresponds in general outlines to the review of Goffredo's army in G. L. I. Rugero, Bradamante and Marfisa are mentioned among the French troops, and a short summary is given of the love of Rugero for Bradamante, the defeat of Rodamonte by the former and the conversion of Rugero and his sister, Marfisa, as narrated by Ariosto. Chronologically then, the action of this poem is placed after the events described in the *Orlando Furioso*.

BOOK V

Alecto appears to the Moorish king, Marsilio, in the form of Abdalla, his father, and bids him to form an alliance with the Asturians and to make use of his niece Zayda to bring confusion into the French army. In like manner, Aletto appears to Solimano and urges him to attack the Christians, G. L. IX, 8-9.

E. D., 2:

En Abdalla su padre transformado,
con habla, y estatura conocida,
toma la blanca barba, y el surcado
rostro, que indicios dan de edad crecida.
El corbo alfange en el siniestro lado,
con la Almalafa larga recogida,
retrato en todo del que hurtó la muerte,
habla con el dormido desta suerte:

G. L. IX, 8:

A costui viene Aletto; e da lei tolto
 è 'l sembiante d'un uom d'antica etade:
 vòta di sangue, empie di crespe il volto,
 lascia barbuto il labro, e 'l mento rade;
 dimostra il capo in lunghe tele avvolto;
 la veste oltra 'l ginocchio al piè gli cade;
 la scimitarra al fianco, e'l tergo carco
 de la faretra, e ne le mani ha l'arco.

E. D., 15:

y mientras habla assi con el dormiente,
 en su pecho penoso, y anhelante
 viuoras pone, y su ponçoña vierte,
 con que le incita á furia, á rabia, á muerte.

G. L. IX, 11:

Cosí gli disse; e le sue furie ardenti
 spirògli al seno, e si mischiò tra'venti.

In stanzas 21-82, the magician Malgesi offers to Charlemagne the use of his arts. The offer is refused, and the magician then relates the early history of the province of Asturias and the traditions concerning Bernardo del Carpio. In stanzas 83ff., we read of a magic book presented to Charlemagne, containing the word America, doubtless a reminiscence of the references to the discovery of the new continent in *Orlando Furioso*, XV, 18ff. and G. L. XV, 22ff.

BOOK VI

The book opens with a description of the various provinces of Spain, presumably taken from the magic book presented to Charlemagne. The latter orders his army to advance to Roncevaux. Meanwhile, the Asturians prepare to resist the French. Bernardo, feeling that he is needed by the Spanish army, takes leave of his sweetheart Elvira in a scene which recalls the love of Erminia for Tancredi in G. L. VI.

BOOK VII

The Asturians rejoice at the arrival of Bernardo. The Englishman, Ricardo, who is destined to play so important a part in the war, offers his services to Alfonso, and relates to him the story of his unhappy love affair with Isabela.

BOOK VIII

The eighth book opens with a description of the Moorish troops, which follows in general outlines the review of the Egyptian army, G. L. XVII. The Spanish forces assemble and Alfonso confers the title of commander-in-chief upon Bernardo, bidding him humble the power of France and to be on his guard against the treacherous Moor. The two armies are finally drawn up face to face and Ricardo kills Beltran in the first skirmish.

BOOK IX

At the opening of Book IX, we have a description of the grief of the French for the death of Beltran. They ask for his body, and the request is granted by Ricardo. The account of Beltran's funeral corresponds closely to that of Dudone, G. L. III, 67-70. Rugero claims the right to avenge the death of Beltran by challenging Ricardo, and his petition is granted by Charlemagne. Bradamante worries over the danger to which he will be exposed and offers to take his place.⁴ Rugero, however, tries to reassure her by reminding her how he had conquered Rodamonte and Mandricardo. Marfisa, Rugero's sister, rises early and goes forth to meet Ricardo in her brother's place.⁵ She summons him to fight, but after the first charge, the Briton sees a lock of her hair beneath her helmet and immediately falls in love with his fair opponent, stanza 48:

No de las astas el vigor crecido
pudo causar en ambos mouimiento;
mas al parar la indomita, rompido
halló de su zelada el ligamento.
Hizo ondear (sin dilacion) Cupido
vaga madexa de oro por el viento;
y mostrando al varon la Fenix hembra,
llamas de amor en sus entrañas siembra.

This is a close imitation of the famous stanza of G. L. III, 21, containing the description of the duel between Tancredi and Clorinda:

⁴ This scene bears a close resemblance to *Orlando Furioso*, XLVI, 113-115, in which Bradamante shows anxiety in regard to the result of Ruggiero's duel with Rodomonte.

⁵ This is probably an imitation of *Orlando Furioso*, XXXVI, 16 ff. in which Marfisa goes out to take Ruggiero's place in his duel with Bradamante.

Clorinda in tanto ad incontrar l'assalto
 va di Tancredi, e pon la lancia in resta.
 Ferirsi a le visiere, e i tronchi in alto
 volaro; e parte nuda ella ne resta;
 ché, rotti i lacci a l'elmo suo, d'un salto
 (mirabil colpo!) ei le balzò di testa;
 e, le chiome dorate al vento sparse,
 giovane donna in mezzo'l campo apparse.

Ricardo bids Marfisa desist from her attack, since she has already conquered him by her beauty. This corresponds in general outlines with G. L. III, 27-28. Rugero reproaches Marfisa for having presumed to take his place in the combat, and in the meantime, Bradamante draws near and offers to fight with Ricardo. Rugero finally succeeds in sending his wife and sister back to the army, and postpones his duel with Ricardo.

Marsilio sends his niece Zayda to the French camp to disorganize the army by her wiles, stanza 68ff. Armida plays the same role in G. L. IV, 23 ff. He explains his project to her, 69-73, just as Idraote declares his plan to Armida, G. L. IV, 24-26. Armida accepts the commission gladly. In the Spanish version, Zayda has more womanly scruples and only agrees on considering the great service she may render to her uncle and to her country. Figueroa omits the description of the physical charms of Zayda, corresponding to G. L. IV, 30-32. The Spanish version then relates the discussion over the election of Beltran's successor, and Orlando's quarrel with the traitor Ganelon.

BOOK X

The description of the arrival of Zayda in the French camp is translated almost literally from the *Gerusalemme Liberata*.

E. D. 4:

Las lenguas la subliman, y los ojos
 llenos de admiracion, la lisongean:
 ella lo echa de ver, y sus despojos
 ciertos (sin dilacion) juzga que sean.

G. L. IV, 33:

Lodata passa e vagheggiata Armida
 fra le cupide turbe; e se n'avvede:

no'l mostra già, benché in suo cor ne rida,
e ne disegni alte vittorie e prede.

Zayda meets Carloto who immediately falls in love with her, and promises to conduct her to Charlemagne. In like manner, Eustazio leads Armida to Goffredo, G. L. IV, 33-38. Zayda tells Charles how her uncle had unjustly banished her from the kingdom which rightfully belonged to her, and asks the aid of a hundred knights to redress her wrongs. This agrees with Armida's account to Goffredo, G. L. 39-69. After some hesitation, Charles promises to aid her after he has defeated the Asturian army. In like manner, Goffredo promises to help Armida after the capture of Jerusalem. Reynaldos and the other knights, unable to endure the laments of Zayda, urge that aid be given her at once, and Charles finally yields, stanzas 33-42. This corresponds closely to G. L. IV, 70-84 in which Eustazio and other enamoured knights overrule the objections and scruples of Goffredo.

Ganelon tries to enter into negotiations with Bernardo to bring about the defeat of the French. Bernardo refuses, and warns Charlemagne of the plot invented by the traitor. Charles summons him, convinces him that he is aware of his treachery and casts him into prison.

In the last part of the book (87-108), Beltran appears in a dream to Charlemagne, and after describing in mystical tone the joys of Heaven, warns the Emperor that his cause is unjust. The scene was probably suggested by the appearance of Ugone in a dream to Goffredo, G. L. XIV, 5-19, but aside from the framework, there is little similarity in the two accounts.

Book XI

The description of the intense heat suffered by the French army, 1-9, is translated almost literally from G. L. XIII, 52-63. Zayda chafes at the delay in rendering her assistance and by her wiles brings about a quarrel between Dudon and Reynaldos, 10-30.

The latter part of the book, 31-92, is devoted to an account of the legend of *Las doncellas de Simancas* and a eulogy of the Figueroa family, which received its name as the result of a victory of a certain Bativa over the Moors who demanded a tribute of a

hundred maidens, among whom was his sweetheart Rosarda. The legend is, of course, Spanish⁶ and was included here by the author, partly through personal vanity, and also to flatter the powerful Figueroa family. The use of the story in this connection may have been suggested by the well-known episode of the *Orlando Furioso*, X, 93ff., in which Angelica is saved by Ruggiero from certain marauders who went about in quest of damsels to expose to a monster.

BOOK XII

Zayda insists that the promised escort be given her, lots are cast and fifty warriors are chosen to accompany her. Carloto, desirous of following the maiden, joins the party later, 1-18. Likewise in the *Gerusalemme Liberata*, ten knights are selected by lot to assist Armida, and Eustazio escapes from camp and overtakes them, V, 67-80.

Charles wearis of the war, urges that the expedition be abandoned and imprisons Hugo for inciting the soldiers to disobey the Emperor's orders. The scene then changes to the Spanish camp. Elvira laments the absence of her lover, Bernardo, and finally determines to rejoin him. She arms herself and while seeking Bernardo, sets free Carloto and the other French knights who had fallen victims to the arts of Zayda, 57-91. In like manner, Erminia departs in search of Tancredi, G. L. VI, 79-94. The description of Elvira's victory over the Moors may be borrowed from the *Orlando Furioso*, XXXV, where Bradamante defeats Rodomonte and sets free a number of captives.

BOOK XIII

The two armies are drawn up for battle. Bernardo encourages his men, 4-10, in almost the same words as Goffredo in G. L. XX, 11-19. Bernardo addresses Ricardo, 13, as Goffredo addresses Rinaldo, G. L. XX, 11. The following stanzas, describing the first skirmishes, closely correspond in the two versions: E. D. 15 and G. L. XX, 21; E. D. 23 and G. L. XX, 5; E. D. 24 and G. L. XX,

*Señor Menéndez y Pelayo has studied the legend in the introduction to Lope de Vega's play, *Las Doncellas de Simancas*, Spanish Academy edition of the *Obras de Lope de Vega*, Vol. VII, p. LXV ff.

28-29; E. D. 26 and G. L. XX, 29; E. D. 29 and G. L. XX, 32; E. D. 30 and G. L. XX, 33; E. D. 58 and G. L. XX, 52; E. D. 59 and G. L. XX, 51; E. D. 91 and G. L. XX, 57.

BOOK XIV

The last Book opens with a description of the flight of the French who are closely pursued by the Asturians. Ricardo overtakes Marfisa. She wishes to avenge the death of Beltran, but he pleads his cause so eloquently that her heart is touched and she consents to accept his love, 5-22. The scene corresponds closely to that in which Tancredi pleads his cause to Clorinda, G. L. III, 25-28. In the latter version, however, the scene is interrupted by the arrival of some knights, one of whom wounds the fair Amazon.

Elvira meets Suero Hernando and tells him how she has followed Bernardo into battle, without being able to overtake him. When the latter hears the news, he sets out at once in pursuit of his sweetheart, 23-34. This is followed by an account of the duel which, as Figueroa acknowledges, follows closely the combat between Tancredi and Argante, G. L. XIX. A few extracts will show that the Spanish poem follows the Italian model even in the slightest details.

E. D. 51:

Mientras el de Leon entrar intenta,
la espada que se opone desuando,
á la vista su punta le presenta
astutamente el valeroso Orlando.
Este al reparo va, mas tan violenta
aquei la cala al punto, que alcançando
al contrario del golpe inaduertido,
dexó su yzquierdo lado mal herido.

G. L. XIX, 14:

Mentre il Latin di sottentrar ritenta,
sviando il ferro che si vede opporre,
vibra Argante la spada, e gli appresenta
la punta a gli occhi; egli al riparo accorre;
ma lei si presta allor, si violenta
cala il Pagan, che'l difensor precorre,
e'l fere al fianco; e visto il fianco infermo,
grida: "Lo schermitor vinto è di scherмо."

E. D. 70:

Moria Orlando, y qual viuio moria,
 en lugar de quexarse, amenazaua :
 fueron brauas, horrendas, y ferozes
 sus postreras acciones, y sus voces.

G. L. XIX, 26:

Moriva Argante, e tal moria qual visse ;
 minacciava morendo, e non languia.
 Superbi, formidabli e feroci
 gli ultimi moti fur, l'ultime voci.

Elvira finds the wounded Bernardo, 73ff., just as Erminia finds the wounded Tancredi, XIX, 104 ff. The poem ends with a description of the joy of the Spaniards over their victory.

It will be seen that Figueroa composed his poem with a copy of the *Gerusalemme Liberata* constantly at his side. Not only the general outlines, but also the chief characters and incidents were borrowed with but slight changes. It is true that the imitation was rarely successful. Figueroa lacked entirely Tasso's poetic temperament. The beautiful figures of speech of the Italian are disfigured by his persistent use of *culto* words. The characters are stereotyped. Orlando and Charlemagne, although represented with greater dignity than in many of the Italian poems, are colorless. The figures of Bernardo and Elvira are more successfully portrayed, but Zayda is merely a silhouette of the charming coquette Armida. Figueroa is more interesting as a censor of morals than as a writer of verse, and his attempt to imitate Tasso confirms the dictum that moralists are rarely great poets. In spite of its shortcomings, however, the study of his epic is not without interest, presenting as it does, a French subject, treated from the Spanish standpoint, in the Italian manner.

J. P. WICKERSHAM CRAWFORD.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

THE SOURCES OF THE SYMBOLICAL LAY COMMUNION

THE most recent and the fullest discussion of the symbolical lay communion, a practise that is described in various medieval works, French, Spanish, Italian and German, has been given us by Professor J. D. M. Ford.¹ The latest instance cited by him of the mediaeval rite appears in the *Vita di Benvenuto Cellini*.² This literary evidence shows that it was the custom on the eve of a battle, or at the moment of dying to put in one's mouth, in place of the unavailable sacramental bread, blades of grass,³ or a bit of earth, the latter substitute being confined to the instances other than French. In the majority of the French cases three blades of grass are the substitute for the communion; in one case the single blade of grass is broken into three pieces, in another case it is blessed three times.⁴ As earth is the substitute for the sacrament elsewhere than in the French instances, one is tempted to consider it as the original substitute. The earliest French and German works which vouch for the respective substitutes do not furnish a criterion for

¹ *Publications of the Mod. Lang. Ass.*, XX, 197-230.

² To those mentioned by Ford, who have noted or commented on the French custom, are to be added: Ferdinand Wolf in his review of Michel's *Chroniques anglo-normandes*, published in the *Jahrb. f. Literatur*, vols. 76-77, Wien, 1836 and 1837, reprinted in his *Kleinere Schriften*, ed. E. Stengel (1890), 108, n. 3; E. Du Méril, *La Mort de Garin* (1846), xliii-xliv; E. Gachet, *Glossaire du Chevalier au Cygne* (1859), 366; A. Tobler, "Ueber das volksthümliche Epos der Franzosen," *Zeitschr. f. Völkerpsychologie und Sprachwissenschaft*, IV (1866), 192-193; F. Michel, *Floriant et Florete* (1873), xlii; A. Schultz, *Das höfische Leben*, II (1880), 265. To the French cases not cited by Ford, or in the course of this study are to be added *Chans. des Saxons*, II, 136; *Godefroi de Bouillon*, ed. Reiffenberg, II, 398.

³ There is no authority for the substitute of leaves of a tree (Ford, 211). The phrase of *Raoul de Cambrai*, "trois fuelles d'arbre," cited by Ford after Gautier (209) from Le Glay's poor edition, should read, ".III. fuelles d'erbe" (v. 8441, ed. Meyer et Longnon).

⁴ *Mort de Garin*, 2785:

Un follet d'erbe entre ses pies a pris;
Trois fois le seigne, en sa bouche l'a mis,
Por corpus Deu l'a receu et pris.

the priority of one or the other, as they are almost contemporaneous. The *Estorie des Engles* of Geffrei Gaimar was written between 1147 and 1151,⁵ *Meier Helmbrecht* of Wernher der Gartenaere between 1236 and 1250,⁶ and Berthold von Regensburg preached the sermon,⁷ in which he denounced the practise, during his sojourn in South Germany, Austria, and Steiermark, between 1250 and 1260.⁸ Professor Ford has done well in rejecting the conjecture of an unintelligent writer,⁹ who, in discussing the few French cases known to him, supposed that its appearance in the *Chanson d'Antioche* pointed to an Eastern origin of the practise. For it is by a mere chance that the evidence of the survival of two distinct popular beliefs appears only in the thirteenth century as a Christian ceremony, in different parts of Europe, of which the civilization and religion were nothing but a veneered paganism. In the same way it is only in the fifteenth century that one finds evidence for the widely spread popular belief that a rain- or hail-storm could be brought on by beating a body of water with rods,¹⁰ and the fact that the custom of a murderer eating a sop of food within ten days of the murder, on the tomb of his victim, to save himself from vengeance, is not vouched for by imperial edicts, municipal statutes and medieval chronicles, is no reason to reject¹¹ the explanation given by the

⁵ G. Paris, *La littérature française au moyen-age*, 3d ed., 145.

⁶ F. Vogt, in Paul's *Grundriss*, 2d ed., II, 1, 211.

⁷ Ford (217-218) refers to two sermons in which Berthold refers to the practise (*Berthold von Regensburg. Vollständige Ausgabe seiner Predigten*, ed. Pfeiffer-Strobl, I, 303; II, 89), but the two sermons are really one (A. Schönbach, *Sitzungsb. d. Wien. Ak. Phil. Hist. Cl.*, 153, Part IV, 66, 67; cf. *Anz. f. Deutsch. Alterthum*, VII, 379), of which the Latin version appears as No. 34 in the *Sermones ad religiosos*. Cf. G. Jacob, *Die lat. Reden des Berthold v. Regensburg*, 35, 91, and Schönbach, WSB., 151, Part II, 153 (No. 68). Schönbach has not mentioned the practise, where one would expect to find it, either in his discussion of popular beliefs in Berthold's works, or in his account of the preacher's ideas on death, and the sacraments (*Zeugnisse B. V. R. zur Volkskunde*, WSB., 142; Part VII; *Ueber Leben, Bildung und Persönlichkeit B. v. R.*, WSB., 154, Part I, 94, 116-119).

⁸ K. Rieder, *Das Leben Berthold von Regensburg*, 25; Schönbach, WSB., 147, Part V, 86.

⁹ Rev. W. Silvester, *Dublin Review*, CXXI, 92; cf. Ford, 213-215.

¹⁰ As I shall show in detail in my second article on "Rain-making Storms" (cf. R. R., II, 355 ff.).

¹¹ As by Torracca and Grandgent, *ad loc.*

majority of the older commentators of Dante's line (*Purg.*, XXXIII, 36):

Che vendetta di Dio non teme suppe.

This custom again is a survival of primitive beliefs.¹²

Wackernagel,¹³ who was the first to discuss with any fullness the symbolic communion, considered that it was a survival of an old pagan belief that the earth was made from the body of a giant god, a belief that was brought into relation with the Christian doctrine of the Eucharist. Rochholz and J. W. Wolf¹⁴ accepted this explanation, which has been fully confirmed, if with wider definitions, by recent studies upon the beliefs in the powers of the earth, and the rites connected with them. As the universal mother of all, and as such, sacred, the earth was invoked as a participant in the most solemn oaths, such as in the Old Norse rite of going under strips of sod, "at *ganga under jarðarmen*," particularly in the ceremony of becoming foster-brothers,¹⁵ and analogous rites. Just as widely spread as the custom of having a mother bear her child on the bare earth,¹⁶ or on its substitute, straw,¹⁷ or laying the newly born

¹² As I hope to show in a future article, but for illustrations of the belief cf. J. G. Frazer, *Psyche's Task*, 86-88.

¹³ *Zeitschr. f. deut. Alterthum*, VI (1848), 288-9.

¹⁴ Ford, 201-2.

¹⁵ P. E. Müller, *Laxdaela saga*, 1826, 396-400; Grimm, *Deutsche Rechtsalterthümer*, 4th ed., I, 164-6; K. Nyrop, *Dania*, I, 24-6; Pappenheim, *Zeitschr. f. deut. Philol.*, XXIV, 157-161; K. Maurer, *Zeitschr. d. Ver. f. Volksk.*, III, 103-7; K. Weinhold, *ibid.*, 224-5. I owe these references to my friend Mr. Halldór Hermannsson of the Cornell University Library. Cf. his *Ancient Laws of Norway and Iceland* (Ithaca, 1911), pp. 49, 63, 67, 81.

¹⁶ A. Dieterich, *Mutter Erde*, 6 ff.; E. Samter, *Geburt, Hochzeit und Tod* (1911), 1 ff. An early and the only Greek evidence for the custom is found in the account of the birth of Alexander in the Pseudo-Callisthenes *τοῦ δὲ παιδὸς τεύρος εἰς τὴν γῆν* (I, 12; ed. Müller); whence it passed into the Ethiopic translation (Transl. Budge, 12), and the Latin versions of Julius Valerius (Ed. Kübler, 11, 27) the *Epitome* (Ed. Zacher, 15, 12; ed. Cillie, 9, 14) and the *De praeliis* (Ed. Landgraf, 38, 19; cf. A. Hilka *Rom. Forsch.*, XXIX, 18, 39), but only appears in the Middle-English *Wars of Alexander* (Ed. Skeat, p. 18) of all the occidental vernacular versions which have been printed.

¹⁷ Dieterich, *op. cit.*, 8, n. 1; Samter, *op. cit.*, 4-5; J. Jónasson, "Um faðingu og dauða i Þjóðtrú Íslendinga," *Festskrift til H. F. Falberg* (1911), 376. I owe the last reference to Mr. Hermannsson. Cf. W. Jochelson, *The Yukaghirs and the Yukaghirized Tungus*, 101. For the act as a ceremony by which the strength of the earth passes into the child cf. Deubner, in Hastings, *Encycl. of Religion and Ethics*, II, 649 b.

child on the earth, to bring the child in touch with the universal earth mother, the source of human life, is the practise of laying a dying man on the bare earth, or on straw, so that his soul can pass without delay to the earth, conceived as its source, or, as the kingdom of the dead.¹⁸ A variation of the same practice is found in Finistère, Brittany. When a man is in a painful death struggle, an infallible method to hasten his death is to put his naked feet on the bare ground.¹⁹ For the same purpose a piece of earth is placed on his breast in Thuringia.²⁰ Lastly, we find the Christian element as it appears in medieval literature, in the Magyar and Roumanian custom of placing earth in the mouth of those who have died un-

¹⁸ Samter, "Zu römischen Bestattungsbraüchen," *Festschrift für O. Hirschfeld*, 249 ff.; "Antike und moderne Totengebräuche," *Neue Jahrb. f. class. Alterthum*, XV, 36 ff.; *Geburt, Hochzeit und Tod*, 4; Dieterich, *op. cit.*, 25-29. "A Limoges le dernier Rituel, édité en 1698, avait encore conservé pour ce diocèse l'ancien usage de l'église de mettre mourir le malade sur le cilice (ou sur la paille) et la cendre." In the community of La Trappe, "à l'extrême on les (i. e., les religieux) met mourir sur la paille ou sur la cendre"; Lebrun-Desmarettes, *Voyages liturgiques en France* (1718), 146. The Abbé Cochet, who cites these passages, found the bodies of ecclesiastics and laymen buried at Etran, from the thirteenth to the seventeenth century, lying on or wrapped in straw, and remarks: "On dit communément en parlant d'un défunt qui n'est pas encore inhumé, 'Il est sur la paille.'" "Explorations des Anciens Cimetières de Roux-Mesnil et d'Etran," *Archæologia*, XXXIX, 132. There are two Scotch phrases used more than once by Sir Walter Scott, "stræ death," "fair-stræ death," meaning natural death, which have their source in Scandinavian terms analogous to the Old Norse *stradauda*, "one who dies on the straw," Danish *strædød*, "Straw death" and Old Swedish *stradøia*, "to die on straw," terms referring to a natural as opposed to a violent death. But the custom which interests us is something more than a survival of the time when bedsteads were unknown, as Monsieur ("La proscription religieuse de l'usage récent," *Rev. de l'hist. des Religion*, LIII, 299-301; cf. 204) and Zachariae (*Zeitschr. d. Ver. f. Volksk.*, XXII, 232-233) would have us believe is the case.

¹⁹ A. Le Braz, *La Légende de la Mort chez les Bretons Armoricains*, 3d ed. Avec des Notes . . . Par G. Dottin, I, 84. Dottin goes quite astray in connecting with this custom (*loc. cit.*), the custom in Morbihan of placing a "boule de granit" on the head of a dying man, on the authority of L. Bonnemère, "Le mat bénit," *Rev. des Trad. pop.*, XII, 100. Here we have a survival of the "holy mawle" with which an aged person was killed. Cf. *Rev. d. Trad. pop.*, VII, 153, 287; G. L. Gomme, *Folklore as an Historical Science*, 68-78.

²⁰ Wuttke, *Deutsche Volksgläube*, 3d ed., 724; Samter, *Festschr. f. Hirschfeld*, 251. The custom is noted by Grimm, who does not localize it; D. R. A., I, 154. Cf. also Brand, *Popular Antiquities*, ed. Ellis, II (1849), 235; Gregor, *Folk-Lore of the North East Scotland*, 207; J. G. Campbell, *Superstitions of Scottish Highlands*, 241; *Folk-Lore*, XIII, 60, XVI, 66.

expectedly, and without confession, so that the earth may rest lightly on them in the afterworld,²¹ and they may have peace; and in a belief of the Armenians, according to which a man dying alone may make confession to a tree or a rock, and put in his mouth a bit of earth in place of the sacrament.²² The custom of the Armenians of kissing the ground when they face the altar in prayer²³ appears to be as much a survival of an older faith, as that of putting sacramental bread into the coffin as food for the dead on their journey,²⁴ and the persistent reverence for trees.²⁵ The Raskolnir or members of the Old Church in Russia use a similar substitute for the sacrament,²⁶ a custom in conformity to their belief that guardian angels give invisibly the sacrament at the moment of death, the only time when men are pure.²⁷

The fullest account of the demand for, and the reception of a bit of earth as a substitute for the communion is found in an interpolation of the *Eckenliet*, as a completion of the demand of Helferich von Lüne, found in the genuine poem.²⁸ It appeared first in the edition of the poem printed in 1491, and was reprinted in the editions of 1559 and 1577,²⁹ showing how late the belief in its efficacy persisted in Germany.

"Mein leben das gaht auch dahin;
Er ist vmb mich ergangen.
Gib mir der erd in meinen mund
Jn namen Christus ehre.

²¹ v. Wlislocki, *Aus dem Volksleben der Magyaren*, 5; Samter, *Geburt*, etc., 4, n. 1.

²² von Haxthausen, *Transcaucasia* (London, 1854), 317.

²³ H. F. B. Lynch, *Armenia*, I, 69. A celebrated Albigensian leader of the early fourteenth century in the service "courbait la tête jusqu'au sol en s'appuyant de ses mains, baisant la terre" (J. N. Vidal, "Doctrine des derniers ministres albigois," *Rev. des Quest. hist.*, LXXXVI, 16).

²⁴ M. Tchéraz, *L'Orient inédit*, 236. As a practise of the early Christian church cf. J. B. Thiers, *Traité des superstitions qui regardent les sacrements*, Seconde Partie, Livr. III, ch. ii; in *Superstitions anciennes et modernes*, J. F. Bernard, Amsterdam, 1733, pp. 50-51.

²⁵ Tchéraz, *op. cit.*, 229 ff.

²⁶ von Haxthausen, *loc. cit.*;

²⁷ von Haxthausen, *Studien über die innern Zustände etc. Russlands*, I, 358. Cf. how the communion is given through "Rosinen durch das Mütterchen die feuchten Erde" in the same sect (K. K. Grass, *Die russischen Sekten*, I, 412, n.).

²⁸ Ford, 214.

²⁹ *Deutsche Heldenbuch*, V, xxxvi, 290.

Ja ich Held zu diser stund
 Genesen nimmer mehre,
 Mit mir so ringt der bitter todt.
 Ach reicher Christ von hymmel
 Verleicht mir des hymmels brodt."

Da greyff herr Eck, der küne mann,
 Da nider auff den grünen plan,
 Vnd nam der reynen erde,
 Vnd thet sye an der selben stund
 Dem wunden mann in seinen mund.
 Mit jamer sprach der werde:
 "Der glaub der werd an dir volleyst
 Für das hellische fewre.
 Gott Vatter, Sun, heyliger Geyst,
 Kum deiner seel zu stewre,
 Das dir der hymmel sey bereyt,
 Das helft dir Gott der gute,
 Durch sein barmhertzigkeyt."³⁰

The *Moralia* of St. Gregory (495) interprets "terra" in the passage of *Job* (IX, 24):

Terra data est in manus impii, vultum judicum ejus operit: quod si non ille est, quis ergo est?, as "caro Christi";³¹ and the pagan custom may have been given a Christian tone through the influence of this passage in one of the most popular of medieval works.³²

It is striking that Ferdinand Wolf,³³ the first to comment on the Old French custom, has also been the first and only one—with that divination peculiar to genius—to suggest that its origin was to be sought in the symbolical and ritual use of grass and straw. Quite recently the deceased Sanscrit scholar, R. Pischel,³⁴ working out in detail the suggestions of Jacob Grimm³⁵ and Felix Liebrecht,³⁶ has

³⁰ *Ecken Ausfahrt, Nach dem alten Strasburger Drucke von MDLIX*, ed. Schade, 58-9.

³¹ IX, 28; Migne, *Patr. Lat.*, LXXV, 882C.

³² A. Ebert, *Allg. Ges. d. Literatur des Mittelalters*, I (2d ed.) 596; Manitius, *Ges. d. Lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, I, 98-101.

³³ *Loc. cit.*, "Ueber den uralten Glauben an die heilige Kraft des Grases und Halmes vgl. J. Grimm, Deutsche Rechtsalterthümer, S. 110-130."

³⁴ "Ins Gras beißen," *Sitzungsb. d. Berl. Ak.*, 1908, 445-464.

³⁵ D. R. A., I, 154 ff., 168 ff. Cf. J. Michelet, *Origines du Droit français*, 91-8.

³⁶ "Grashalm in Munde," *Zur Volkskunde*, 383-4.

shown that it was the custom among the Indian, Italic, Germanic, and Slavic peoples for a conquered man to take grass or straw into his mouth or hand, as a token to his conqueror of his submission, and as a plea for mercy. The source of the custom in Vedic India he traces to the formula spoken when a cow was saved from sacrifice: "Set her free. Let her eat grass." A vanquished man was treated symbolically as a beast of the field, whose life had been spared. In an Indian epic a king puts grass on his head to denote that he wishes to sell himself.

A striking survival of the custom in the occident is to be found in the homage the haughty hero of the *Poema del Cid* pays to his king;

Los inojos e las manos en tierra los fincó,
Las yerbas del campo a dientes las tomó.^{37a}

In medieval and modern Germany the custom has been noted of tying a wisp of straw to horses to show that they are for sale.³⁷ In a fifteenth century *Fastnachtspiel*, a lover complains that his mistress, to test him, has ordered him to go about for two years, with one eye closed, and a straw in his mouth:

Und steck ein halm in den munt.³⁸

In Northern England and in Scotland up to a recent date, a farm-hand looking for a position walked round at fairs with a straw, or a green sprig in his mouth or hat.³⁹ In the early decades of the last century one could still see in the precincts of the courts of Westminster, men who were willing to bear false witness, go about with straw in their shoes, to show their profession.⁴⁰ And in India

^{37a} Ed. Pidal, vv. 2021-2.

³⁷ Berthold von Regensburg, *Vollständige Ausgabe seiner Predigten*, II (ed. Strobl), 187, 637. This custom is not mentioned in the Latin form of the sermon published by Schönbach, *Sitzungsb. d. Wien. Ak.*, 151, Part II, 33; cf. 153, Part IV, 67. "Dans l'ile de Man, dit Spelman (Coll. 156) c'est encore l'usage qu'on ratifie la vente des chevaux ou de toute autre chose, en donnant la paille" (Michelet, *op. cit.*, 97).

³⁸ Keller, *Fastnachtspiele*, 125; cf. Liebrecht, 383.

³⁹ W. Hone, *Every Day Book and Table Book*, II (1838), 668; *Notes and Queries*, 1st Sv., IV, 43; J. F. Campbell, *Popular Tales of the West Highlands* (ed. 1890), II, 318; Brand, *Popular Antiquities*, II, 455.

⁴⁰ Pike, *A History of Crime in England*, II (1876), 377. "Almost within the memory of persons yet living" is his phrase. Cf. Hone, *op. cit.*, I, 157; W. E. Milliken, *Antiquary*, VII, 194. I know no authority for Tawney's statement

the same class of men is recognized by the straw in their ears.⁴¹ No doubt the "man of straw," who lends his name to another for a business transaction owes his name to the same conception.⁴²

Grass like earth, holy, was also invoked in oaths. Thus Raoul de Cambrai pursuing his old enemy Ernaut de Douai refuses to hear his plea for mercy;

"voir" dist Raous, "il te convient fenir,
A ceste espée le chief del bu partir;
Terre ne erbe ne te puet atenir,
Ne Diex ne hom ne t'en puet garantir,
Ne tout li saint qi Dieu doivent servir."

He has blasphemed, so Ernaut plucks up courage to reply;

"Qant Dieu renoies et la soie amistié,
Car terre et herbe si m'avoit tost aidie,
Et Dieus de gloire, c'il en avoit pitié."⁴³

and in fact his life is saved and it is Raoul who dies unrepentant.⁴⁴ In the same way in English ballads one finds such phrases as;

And she sware by the grass sae green;⁴⁵

and a favorite oath in the *Merry Devil of Edmonton* is "By grass and by hay."⁴⁶ Etienne de Bourbon tells how vows to go on the (Pischel, 456) that a straw carried in the mouth marked the profession of this gentry.

⁴¹ R. H. Wallace, N. E. Q., 8th Ser., X, 195.

⁴² The evidence in regard to "grass-widow," "Strohwittwe," is too confusing to state with certainty that these terms too had the same origin.

⁴³ Ed. Meyer et Longnon, 3015-3019, 3029-3031.

⁴⁴ Settegast's explanation of the episode ("Erde und Gras als Rechtssymbol im Raoul de Cambrai," *Zeit. f. rom. Philol.*, XXXI, 588-593), which postulates a judicial combat in the older form of the poem, is as fantastic as it is unnecessary. Cf. P. Meyer, *Romania*, XXXVII, 476.

⁴⁵ F. Wolf, *loc. cit.*, "und [ueber] den noch in späterer Zeit in England üblichen Schwur beym heil. Gras, Halm u. s. w.: Edw. Barry, *Sur les vicissitudes et les transformations du Cycle populaire de Robin Hood*. Paris, 1832. 8, p. 94. Cf. Grimm, D. R. A., I, 163; Child, *Ballads*, II, 137, 143-4; W. R. Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, 2d ed., 142.

⁴⁶ Act. II, Sc. I, 6, 32, 58; Act. IV, Sc. I, 38, 68, 75; Sc. II, 23, 41, 67: *Shakespeare Apocrypha*, ed. C. F. Tucker Brooke; cf. A. E. H. Swaen, *Englische Studien*, XXIV, 237.

crusade were made on crosses of grass.⁴⁷ The three blades of grass representing originally a pagan symbolical number,⁴⁸ came to be regarded as a symbol of the trinity, in whose name they were taken, or even of the three pieces into which the sacrament was divided by the priest.⁴⁹

It is not strange that grass which was popularly regarded so holy to such a late date, should have been taken as a symbol of the sacrament in the thirteenth century and later. Once taken in the mouth as a token of submission, when in fear of death from a mortal conqueror, it became a Christian symbol, a token of submission to the divine power, when death seemed imminent. That the basis of the Christian practise was the primitive custom is shown by a remarkable survival found in Switzerland half a century ago. In order to heal a family breach, or to stop a dangerous bleeding wound, it was only necessary to take in one's mouth a straw from the thatch of one's house, to stand with a drawn knife before a consecrated crucifix, and saying: "Gott, Sohn und heiliger Geist sollen mich verdammen," to drive the knife into the crucifix.⁵⁰ Blades of grass and straws played a large part as symbols of livery of seisin, in the ceding of landed property of various kinds in Roman and Germanic legal procedure,⁵¹ but in Germanic law splinters from the door-post was the symbol of the delivery of a house.⁵² In the *Roman du Rou* we are told how a soldier presented to William the Conqueror, on his landing in England, a handful of straw from the thatch of a house as a token of seisin of the country;

⁴⁷ *Anecdotes historiques*, ed A. Lecoy de la Marche, pp. 38, 90. Gautier (*La Chevalerie*, 732, n.) has not noted any other instances of the practise. On the custom in modern folk usage cf. Le Braz *op. cit.*, II, 255; *Gentleman's Mag. Library. Pop. Superstitions*, 119, Sébillot *Folk-Lore de France*, III, 476, 500.

⁴⁸ Grimm, D. R. A., I, 286-9. On the use of three blades of grass in a magical performance cf. Panzer, *Beiträge zur deutschen Mythologie*, II, 301.

⁴⁹ Ford, 200, 211.

⁵⁰ E. L. Rochholz, *Deutscher Glaube und Brauch im Spiegel der heidnischen Vorzeit* (1867), I, 46.

⁵¹ Grimm, D. R. A., I, 169 ff., 176 ff. I have not been able to consult A. L. J. Michelsen, *Über die festuca notata und die germanische Traditionssymbolik. Ein germanistischer Vortrag*. Jena, 1856 (cf. *Krit. Übersch.*, IV (1854), 156-9; *Lit. Cbl.*, VII (1856), 653-4); nor J. S. Warren, *De Stroohalm als Rechtssymbol*, *Progr. des Dordrechter Gymnasium*, 1882.

⁵² Grimm, D. R. A., I, 158, 178, 239-240.

Donec corut uns hoem al terrain,
 Sor un bordel tendi sa main,
 Plein poig prist de la couverture,
 Al duc torna grant aleure.
 "Sire, dist il," auant uenez,
 Ceste saisine receuez!
 De ceste terre uos saisis,
 Votre est sainz dote le pais."⁵³

But straw from the thatch of a house was regarded as having a more personal relation to the occupant as is shown in the oft-cited⁵⁴ Swiss custom, vouched for by the pioneer historian of that country, Johann Müller.⁵⁵ When a man living alone, killed some one who attacked him by night, he appeared before the judge, holding three straws from his roof, a dog with his rope (or the cat from the hearth) and the cock from the hen-house, and swore to his innocence. On the Isle of Man, to rob a fisherman of his luck for the day, another fisherman has only to pluck a straw from his thatch in the morning, as he passed to his own work. As Professor Rhys suggests; "getting possession of the straw was supposed to carry with it possession of everything belonging to the other man including his luck in fishing."⁵⁶

And in fact this belief was the basis of a popular test for a witch, once used in England, which is best expressed in a passage of Dekker's *Witch of Edmonton*,⁵⁷

(Enter W. Hamlac, with thatch and a link.)

Haml. Burn the witch, the witch, the witch, the witch.

Omn. What hast got there?

Haml. A handful of thatch pluck'd off a hovel of hers; and they say, when 'tis burning, if she be a witch, she'll come running in.

O. Banks. Fire it, fire it; I'll stand between thee and home for any danger.

(As that burns, enter the witch.)

I. Countryman. This thatch is as good as a jury to prove she is a witch.

⁵³ Ed. Andresen, 6607-6615.

⁵⁴ Grimm, D. R. A., I, 176; II, 126; Panzer, *Beiträge*, II, 472.

⁵⁵ *Schweizergesh.* III, 254 (1806).

⁵⁶ *Celtic Folklore, Welsh and Manx*, I, 345.

⁵⁷ Act IV, Sc. I.

O. Banks. To prove her one, we no sooner set fire on the thatch of her house, but in she came, running as if the devil had sent her in a barrel of gun-powder, which trick as surely proves her a witch. . . .

This method which is not known to any of the continental witch-mongers, such as Institoris and Sprenger, Molitoris, Remigius, Boguet, Bodin, Delrio, and de Lancré, or to their opponents, Weier and Bekker, is mentioned with disapproval by both credulous and sceptical English writers on witchcraft, such as were respectively William Perkins in his *Discourse of the Damned Art of Witchcraft* (1608),⁵⁸ and John Gaule in his *Select Cases of Conscience Touching Witches and Witchcraft* (1646).⁵⁹ This test was offered as evidence against Elizabeth Sawyer of Edmonton, hanged as a witch in 1621, whose trial offered material for Dekker's play.⁶⁰

So in the Swiss custom, the man with the straw in his mouth from his own thatch, offers himself as a servant to the devil.⁶¹

⁵⁸ Ed. 1610.206. On the author and his book cf. W. Notestein, *A History of Witchcraft in England*, 227-230, 227-229; G. L. Kittredge, in *Studies in the History of Religions Presented to C. H. Toy*, 18-21.

⁵⁹ P. 73. On the author and his book cf. Notestein, *op. cit.*, 174-175, 186-187, 236-237.

⁶⁰ Cf. Notestein, 112, 136, n. At a later period the tiles of a witch's dwelling were substituted for the straw of the thatch in sympathetic magical practises; cf. Blagrave, *Astrologic Practice of Physic* (1689) 106; J. Glanvil, *Sadd uicimus Triumphatus*, (1726) 319-320; 334. In Greece a handful of earth from the witch's doorway (J. C. Lawson, *Modern Greek Folklore and Ancient Greek Religion*, 15) or a piece of his clothing is used (*Ib.*; Carnoy et Nicolaides, *Traditions populaires de l'Asie Mineure*, 353). With this practice is to be compared that of detecting a witch by burning some part of the person or thing bewitched; cf. J. G. Dalyell, *The Darker Superstitions of Scotland*, 323-326; Blagrave, *loc. cit.*; Rhys, *op. cit.*, 300-302; 304-307; *Proc. of the Brit. Acad.* IV, 224-225. On the use of straw from a thatch in magical rites in ancient India cf. V. Henry, *La magie dans l'Inde antique*, 162, 202, 204.

⁶¹ Liebrecht, *op. cit.*, 383. Louis Gaufridy, the unfortunate priest, burnt at Aix in 1611 for witchcraft, as the victim of an ecclesiastical persecution, was seen by two Capucins set to spy on him, to pick up some of the straws which made his bed in prison. The hysterical girl, responsible for the charges against him, explained his action with satisfaction to his judges: "On les (*i. e.* les magiciens) cognoit, dit-elle, quand ils s'enclinent en terre, prenant vne paille, car lors ils demandent conseil au diable, et luy font hommage de ceste paille," (S. Michaëlis, *Histoire admirable de la Possession et Conversion d'une Penitente etc.*, 2d. ed., Paris, 1613. Deuxième Partie, 99). The author was one of those principally responsible for the death of Gaufridy.

This belief of the Catholic population of Solothurn was a parody of the touching medieval French ceremony, in which a dying man surrendered his soul to his Creator, as the witches' Sabbat—a belief which cost the lives of unnumbered multitudes—was a parody of the Roman mass. One would expect to find some light on this subject by comparing the various versions of the rite in the French epics containing it, which were translated into other languages, and by noting the devices of the translators to interpret in their o'vn terms a foreign custom. With the exception of the Spanish translator of the ceremony found in *Les Chétifs*,⁶² and of the Dutch translator of *Garin de Loherain*, who in his rendering;

“ Doe dus ghec lagt die ritter goet
Hadde, nam bi onder sienen voet
Drie bladre, die hi in Gods ere
Nutté over onsen Here,”⁶³

has also kept very closely to his French text;

“ Sa corpe bat, pleure por ses pechiez,
Pris a trois pous d'erbe entre ses piez
En nom de Dieu bien les a mengiez,”⁶⁴

the translators have avoided the difficulty by running away from it. The Icelandic version of *Elie de Saint Gilles* has omitted a passage at this point.⁶⁵ The Middle High German *Reinold von Montalban*,⁶⁶ the *Storia di Rinaldino da Montalbano*,⁶⁷ of Andrea dei Magnabotti, and other Italian versions in verse and prose⁶⁸ omit the episode, while Caxton (c. 1489) and the sixteenth century translator of the French prose version have made special efforts to omit the pregnant phrase of their original:

⁶² Ford, 200, 211.

⁶³ M. Mathes, *Roman der Lorreinen* (Bibl. v. Mnl. Letterkunde, 17) Vv. 7-10; cf. Stengel, *Zeit. f. rom. Philol.*, I, 140

⁶⁴ Ms. de l'Arsenal, B-L. F., 181, as cited by E. du Méril, *La Mort de Garin*, xlivi, where is another reading of the version of *Garin*. There is not any German version of the *Garin*, as stated by Ford (216). Müller, *mhd. Wb.*, only cites what is still another reading of the passage in the O. F. *Garin*.

⁶⁵ *Elissaga ok Rosamundu*, ed. Kölbing, 19; cf. Kölbing, *Beiträge*, 103.

⁶⁶ Ed. Pfaff, vv. 7798 ff.

⁶⁷ Ed. C. Minutoli, 166.

⁶⁸ P. Rajna, *Propugnatore*, III, Part 2, 80, 100.

"Alarde sayd to hym, 'brother Reynawde, let us lighte from our mewles a fote, & shryve our selfe the one to the other, to thende that we be not over com by the devyll,'"⁶⁹

"Bruoder," sprach Allard zuo Rengnold, "lass uns abstan und nider knuwen und got unsern schöpffer umm hilf und gnad an rüeffen, damit und er uns gnedig sig unserm letsten end";⁷⁰

"Et communions nous de feuilles du boys a celle fin que nous ne soyons surprins de l'enemy."⁷¹

Two late redactions of the *Chanson de Roland*, the so-called *Roman de Roncevaux*, and that found in a Lyons manuscript represent that Oliver, when dying;

" .iii. peuls a prins de lerbe uerdoiant,
en l'onor deu les usa maintenant" (115, 12-13);

" .iiij. poiz a pris de l'erbe uerdoiant,
en loy de dieu les use maintenant" (72, 12-13).⁷²

The author of *Galiens li Restorés*, who made use of such a redaction,⁷³ has gone one or even two better than his model, in having Roland give the symbolical communion to Oliver:

"Adonc [a] Oliuier la veüe troubla,
Roulant print .III. peux d'erbe dont i l'acomicha";

and Turpin and Roland give it to themselves;

" Lors [Turpin] a prins trois peux d'erbe et s'en va commechier";

" Roulant lieuve da main, son chief print a saignier,
Puis a prins .III. peulxd'erbe et se va commicher."⁷⁴

⁶⁹ *Fourre Sonnes of Aymoned*. O. Richardson (E. E. T. S.), 232.

⁷⁰ *Die Haimonskinder*, ed. A. Bachmann, 115, 11-13.

⁷¹ Cited by Richardson, *op. cit.*, p. vii, from the Lyons (?) edition of 1480, that doubtless used by Caxton (*Ib.* vii), if the exact source of the German translation is unknown (Bachmann, p. x). The manuscript of the French prose version has "et des peus de cele herbe nous acomenion" (Barrois, *Eléments carlovingiens*, 238). The change from blades of grass to leaves must itself rest on a misunderstanding of the one responsible for the rifacimento.

⁷² W. Foerster, *Das altfranz. Rolandslied. Text von Paris, Cambridge, Lyon, etc.* (Altfranzös. Bibl. VII), 105-6.

⁷³ *Ed.* Stengel & Pfeil (A. u. A., LXXXIV), pp. xlvi-xli, 81.

⁷⁴ *Ed. cit.* 230, 24; 47, 234, 3. Cf. p. 215 for correct transcription of the passage of the prose version of the first citation from a manuscript, and an early edition, which Ford (209-210) gives as two separate passages after the incorrect copy of Gautier.

In Pulci's *Morgante*, Turpin, for whose presence at the death of Roland there is no precedent in its chief Italian source,⁷⁵ advises the hero;

"E perchè Iddio nel ciel ti benedica,
Piglia la terra, la terra, la tua madre antica."
"Però che Iddio Adam plasmoe di questa,
Si ch è ti basta per comunione."⁷⁶

For Roland's subsequent action:

"E final mente, la testa inclinata,
Prese la terra, come gli fu detto,
E l'anima spirò del casto petto,"⁷⁷

Pulci's probable source was an Italian work, in which an unfamiliar rite⁷⁸ was replaced by one well known, even in the time of Pulci, who published the second part of his poem containing the episode in 1484, forty years before Cellini dates his involuntary use of the rite.⁷⁹

We have not the French original of the account given in the *Narbonesi* of Andrea dei Magnabotti, of how the companions of Vivien when they were about to begin a last desperate struggle:

Si baciarono tutti in bocca e raccomandaronsi a Dio e si cumunicarono colla terra, l'anime loro rendendo di buono cuore a Dio,⁸⁰

but we may be sure that Andrea adopted to the usages of his own country the French rite that was performed under the same conditions in *Raoul de Cambrai*:

Mains gentix hom s'i acumenia
De iij. poux d'erbe, q'autre prestre n'i a;
S'arme et son cors a Jhesu commanda.⁸¹

⁷⁵ P. Rajna, *Propugnatore*, IV, Parte 2, 117.

⁷⁶ XXVII, 147, 7-148, 2.

⁷⁷ XXVII, 153, 6-8.

⁷⁸ The rite has not been noted in any of the Italian versions of the story of Roland's death. Cf. P. Rajna, *Propugn.*, IV, P. 1, 71, 371; P. 2, 74, 118; *Viaggio di Carlo*, ed. Ceruti, II, 186, 198. Perhaps it was found in the incomplete *Orlando*, the model of first part of the *Morgante* (P. Rajna, *Propugn.*, II, P. 1, 7 ff., 220 ff., 353 ff.; ed. G. Hübschner, A. u. A., LX).

⁷⁹ Cf. Ford, 221-2.

⁸⁰ Ed. Isola, II, 158; cf. Jeanroy, *Rom.*, XXVI, 199, n. 3; R. Weeks, *Origin of the Conv-Vivien*, 21.

⁸¹ Ed. P. Meyer et A. Longnon, 2428-2430.

Giovanni Villani tells us that the Flemings did the same thing before the battle of Courtrai (1302) :

feciono venire per tutto il campo uno prete parato col corpo de Christ o, sicchè ciascuno il vide, e in luogo di comunicarsi, ciascuno prese un poco di terra e si mise in bocca.⁸²

Villani was in Flanders in 1306⁸³ but he was never in the vicinity of the scene of the battle, and only began to write his work nearly fifty years after it took place.⁸⁴ But as the sources for his information at this point were probably semi-official letters sent by Florentine merchants in France and Flanders to the home authorities, one may accept as true this and other details not found in accounts, nearer in time and place to the event.⁸⁵ And yet one of the most reputable of these, that of Velthem,⁸⁶ tells in true epic style how St. George appeared as an aid to the Flemish forces.⁸⁷

The next instance of the rite appears in the account of the battle of Agincourt, in a version of the *Brut*, made about 1436, a work based at this point on an English original, written soon after 1415, the date of the battle.⁸⁸ Before advancing on the enemy :

oure men knelit dounre al attones, and made a cros on þe grounde,
and kissit it, and put hem in þe mercy of God.⁸⁹

⁸² Libr. VI, ch. 56; ed. Moutter, II, 62.

⁸³ De Pauw, *Bulletin de la Comm. d'Histoire de Belgique*, 5, Ser. VI, 594; V. Fris, *ibid.*, X, 1 ff.

⁸⁴ Pirenne, *ibid.*, 4, Ser. XVII, 38 ff.; Funck-Brentano, "Mém. sur la bataille de Courtrai et les chroniqueurs qui en ont traité," *Acad. des Insc. et Belles Lettres, Mémoires présentées par divers Savants*, X, 277-8.

⁸⁵ Funck-Brentano, *op. cit.*, 278.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 269, n. 4. This same chronicler tells how, when the Comte d'Artois, the leader of the French troops, was about to take the communion, the host disappeared (269).

⁸⁷ Matzke, *Publ. Mod. Lang. Ass.*, XVII, 152 ff.; XIX, 449-450. Professor Matzke in his study neglected to note the appearance of the legend of the militant saints in the chronicles of the crusades. I hope to publish soon a study of similar traditions, from that of the appearance of Castor and Pollux at Lake Regillus to almost the present time.

⁸⁸ *The First English Life of King Henry the Fifth written in 1513 by an Anonymous Author known commonly as The Translator of Livius*, Edited by C. L. Kingsford, p. xv. For the dating of the English original I am indebted to a recent communication from Mr. Kingsford, who called my attention to the passage of the *Brut*.

⁸⁹ *The Brut or the Chronicles of England*, Ed. by F. W. D. Brie (E. E. T. S.) 555.

The Latin *Brut*, which was compiled not later than 1436 or 1437 gives a fuller account:

Omnis Angliegenarum exercitus unam porciunculam terre in ore suo sumentes, ac terram ante initium certaminis trina vice deosculantes, genibus pro voluntis, hostes aggrediuntur.⁹⁰

Tito Livio of Forli, who wrote his *Vita Henrici Quinti* under the patronage of Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, in 1437 or 1438,⁹¹ in making use of the Latin *Brut*, summed up the account before him in the phrase; "A singulis in ore capta terrae particula."⁹² An anonymous author of the first English life of Henry V, written in 1513, in translating the phrase of Livio, gives two explanations of the ceremony, of which the second is the true one:

Euerie one of them tooke in his mouth a little peece of earth, in remembraunce of that they were mortall and earth, or else in remembraunce of the wholie Communion.⁹³

If the French contemporary writers do not give this detail in their accounts of the battle,⁹⁴ a statement in the *Gesta Henrici Quinti* of

⁹⁰ C. L. Kingsford, *English Historical Literature in the Fifteenth Century*, 326. I am here again indebted to the kindness of Mr. Kingsford for sending me a copy of this passage, printed in a book nearly ready for publication.

⁹¹ Kingsford, *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XXV, 58-60.

⁹² Ed. Hearne, 1716, pp. 18-19. The phrase has been adopted in the later *Vita et Gesta Henrici* (Ed. Hearne 1727, p. 65) wrongly attributed to Thomas Elmham (Kingsford, *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XXII, 577; XXV, 61-71; Wylie, *ib.* XXIV, 85). It would be curious to see if Decembri in his translation of Livio's work, completed in 1463, which is found in a MS. (2610) of the Imperial Library at Vienna (Wylie, E. H. R. XXIV, 84 ff.) has recognised a custom of his own country, in his rendering of the phrase. In the poem on Agincourt attributed to Lydgate (cf. H. N. MacCracken, *The Lydgate Canon*, xlvi) one finds only the second part of the ceremony described in the Latin *Brut*. Harris Nicholas, *History of the Battle of Agincourt* (321);

Oure Kyngne knelyd doun all in that stownde,
And all the Englys men in eche asyde
And thryys there thay kyssed the gronde,
And on ther fete gan they stond up ryzte.

⁹³ *The First English Life* etc., 59. Stowe changed the phrase to "mortall, and made of earth, as also in remembrance of the holy communion," *Annales* (1631), 349. On Stow's use of this translation cf. Kingsford, E. H. R. XXV, 92; *First Eng. Life*, v-ix, xv, xlvi-xlvii.

⁹⁴ Jean Le Fèvre de St. Rémy, *Chronique*, II, 253; Des Ursins, *Chronique de Charles*, VI (Michaud et Poujoulat, *Mémoires*, XII), 520.

Thomas Elmham, an English chaplain present at the battle, shows why this substitute for the communion was taken by the body of the English troops.⁹⁵ The evening before the battle:

Et tunc unusquisque qui non prius conscientiam suam confessione mundaverat, arma penitentiae sumpsit, et non erat tunc paucitas, nisi solum paucitas sacerdotum.⁹⁶

There were not enough priests with the army to hear the confession of, or give absolution to all, so they confessed to each other or to themselves, and took earth as a substitute for the sacrament,⁹⁷ as the Christians did in the Spanish *Poema de Alfonso XI*,⁹⁸ and the Flemings at Courtrai, even if there were priests present.

Sixty years later, Charles the Bold, Duke of Burgundy, in a letter written May 27, 1475, in describing the attack of his troops on the imperial camp near Neuss, four days before,⁹⁹ tells how:

tous à bon visage et joyeusement marchèrent en faisant le signe

⁹⁵ St. Rémy, who was present as a prisoner of the English, tells of their devotions the day before, and of their confessing the night before the battle (*op. cit.*, 242, 244).

⁹⁶ Ed. Williams, 47.

⁹⁷ It is upon the basis of the evidence of the two English lives of Henry V, and of Villani, of which the latter was only known to him through the continuation of the *Annales de Baroniis* by Spondanus (II, 336), that Lingard (*History of England*, 1849, III, 498, n.), after stating in his text, "the men, falling on their knees, bit the ground, arose, shouted and ran towards the enemy," adds in a note, "This singular custom had been introduced by the peasants of Flanders before the great victory which they gained over the French cavalry at Courtray in 1302. A priest stood in front of the army, holding the consecrated host in his hand; and each man, kneeling down, took a particle of earth in his mouth, as a sign of his desire and an acknowledgement of his unworthiness, to receive the sacrament." These passages furnish, without the need of any comment, as good a test as one would wish to have of the reliability, and the peculiar method of writing history of the author cited. Yet Nicholas (*op. cit.*, 120, n.), Freeman (*Reign of William Rufus*, II, 331, n.), Ramsay (*Lancaster and York*, I, 219, n.), and Ford (211, n.) have quoted them in good faith. And yet already Michelet, who had read his Villani, in preparation for the story of the battle of Courtrai in his *Histoire de France* (III, 1837, 78) inspired by Grimm's *Deutsche Rechtsalterthümer*, had pointed to the only explanation of the symbolical rite in his *Origines du Droit français* (1837) 152-3. He cites here the passages from Cellini, Du Bellay, D'Aubigné, and Fleuranges, and refers to Vieilleville.

⁹⁸ Ford, 199.

⁹⁹ On date of battle and letter cf. *Mémoires de Olivier de la Marche*, ed. Beaune et D'Arbaumont, III, 99, n. 6.

de la Croix en eux, regardant à Dieu, et les Anglois¹⁰⁰ à leur costume croisant la terre et baisant icelle.¹⁰¹

Had the ceremony been simplified since the battle of Agincourt, and become what we shall find it among the German and Swiss mercenaries of a century later, or was the Duke too distant a spectator to see just what his auxiliaries were doing?

Finally in the same region, on the borderland of France and Belgium, where *Raoul de Cambrai* was enacted and written, and where Courtrai was fought, we come upon the most pathetic instance of the lay communion. Here it was not substituted for the real sacrament on account of a paucity of priests. The man who felt the need of it was one of many victims of the fanaticism, the spite and the greed of a clique of ecclesiastic criminals, including Jean, the suffragan bishop of Arras, Jacques du Boys, the dean of Notre-Dame d'Arras, and the inquisitor Pierre le Broussart. This so-called "Vaudois" trial of 1460 was most remarkable in many ways.¹⁰² The accused under the stress of torture, through judicial suggestions and false promises confessed to the most incredible crimes, including making a pact with the devil, and attending the Sabbat, a curious anticipation, if not in fact the model for later procedure in trials for witchcraft. The most remarkable thing in connection with the case is that by the decree of the Parliament of Paris, thirty years later, in 1491, the character of the victims was rehabilitated, their property restored to their heirs, and those of the conspirators still living heavily mulcted. One of the twelve, who were sent to the stake, known as Egidius de Blancourt (Blencourt) or Colin de Bullecourt, from the place of sentence:

¹⁰⁰ On the English troops sent by Edward IV to Charles cf. Ramsay, *op. cit.*, II, 403.

¹⁰¹ Labarre, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de France et de Bourgogne*, I, 362. Jean Molinet, the official chronicler of the court of Burgundy (Cf. P. A. Becker, *Zeit. f. rom. Philol.*, XXVI, 649, 651), gives a less detailed account: "Il (c'est à dire le duc) donna signe d'approcher ses batailles; et toutes gens marchèrent joyeusement faisants le signe de la croix. Dont les Anglois, a leur manière de faire, baisèrent la terre" (Buchon, *Chroniques françaises*, XLIII: *Chroniques de Jean Molinet*, 130).

¹⁰² The fullest account is in H. C. Lea, *History of the Inquisition in the Middle Ages*, III, 519-534. Frederiq has collected the documents together in his *Corpus documentorum inquis.* . . . *Neerlandicae*, I, 345-483; III, 89-111.

fust mené à la justice de l'évesque, et illecq ards et ramené en cendres, et tout pareillement que les autres, dit qu'on le faisoit mourir à tort, et ce qu'il avoit confessé avoit esté à la forche de gehenne; et mourut, comme il sembloit, en vraie et bonne foy; et prist, luy estant prest de mourir, trois paux de terre ou d'herbe, et au nom du Père et du Fils et du Saint-Esprit, et ainsi il mourut.¹⁰⁴

He had recourse to this substitute, because in not confessing to an imaginary crime, and dying penitent, he could not avail himself of the usual privileges offered by inquisitors to their victims,¹⁰⁴ expressed in one of the sentences of the ecclesiastical court in this trial, by the phrase:

si signa penitencie in vobis vel aliquo vestrum apparuerint, sacramenta confessionis et eucaristie non denegetur.¹⁰⁵

The contemporary chronicler Jacques du Clercq, or his authority, evidently was not acquainted with the rite, and in the confusion of the hour could not make out whether it was grass or earth, that was picked up, but as it happened on French soil, we may be sure that it was three blades of grass.

What seems a survival of the custom was found among the German lansquenets in French service in the religious wars of the sixteenth century. In his account of the conte de Reintgrave, Brantôme tells how, when Charles IX was reviewing the troops he had engaged in Germany:

luy et ses compagnons de loing, ayans baisé la terre, et en jetté chacun une poignée derrière les epaules à leur mode.¹⁰⁶

before they advanced in battle array. The second part of the ceremony is vouched for elsewhere as a distinct ceremony,¹⁰⁷ and according to Paulus Jovius,¹⁰⁸ it was used to conciliate the god of victory. But the kissing of the ground as a single act is reported of the German troops, who fought under Coligny at the disastrous

¹⁰⁴ *Memoires de J. du Clercq*, Livre IV, Ch. 9, in Buchon, *Chroniques fran- caises*, XXXIX, 35-6.

¹⁰⁵ Lea, *op. cit.*, I, 546.

¹⁰⁶ Fredericq, *Corpus*, I, 370. The French form is given, *ibid.*, III, 91.

¹⁰⁷ *Discours sur le Couronnel de l'Infanterie de France*, *Oeuvres*, ed. L. Lalanne, VI, 121.

¹⁰⁸ Barthold George von Frundsberg (Hamburg, 1833), 58-9, cited by Grimm, D. R. A., I, 160.

¹⁰⁹ *Historiae sui temporis*, II (1552), 477; cf. *Oeuvres de Brantôme*, VI, 502.

battle of Montcontour in 1569. On the eve of battle "les lanskenets ayant baisé la terre à leur mode," rushed into the fight.¹⁰⁹

An earlier account of the same custom is found in the *Mémoires* of Fleuranges,¹¹⁰ where the author is telling about a skirmish in Luxemburg in 1512:

Et adonc lesdicts Lansquenets et le jeune Adventureux avecques eux baisèrent la terre, comme ils font de coutume, et marchèrent tout droilt contre leurs ennemis.

The Swiss troops practised the same rite according to Martin Du Bellay in his account of a skirmish between the imperial troops and those of de Lautrec, which took place near Naples in 1528;

L'escarmouche se dressa . . . apres que noz Suisses eurent (comme ils ont accoustumé) baisé la terre.¹¹¹

Finally when the symbolical and religious use of earth was forgotten in Occidental Europe,¹¹² we find its survival in the popular German belief that a witch must be taken to the place of execution in a copper caldron, so that he may not touch the earth, of which he need have only the smallest bit, in order to disappear through the practice of his magical arts, and the aid of the devil.¹¹³

GEORGE L. HAMILTON.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY.

¹⁰⁹ D'Aubigné, *Hist. universelle*, V, Ch. xvii, ed. A. de Rublé, III, 120.

¹¹⁰ Fleuranges, dit *l'Adventureux* (Petitot, *Mémoires sur l'histoire de France*, XVI), 227.

¹¹¹ *Mémoires*, ed. Bourilly et Vindry, II, 66. This may well be the source of the phrase "et avoient déjà les Suisses et lansquenets baisé la terre" in the account of the same engagement in that romance (cf. A. Hauser, *Sources de l'Histoire de France* (1494-1610), II, 33), the *Mémoires de la Vie de Francois de Scepeaux, sire de Vielleville* (Petitot, XXVI), I, 31.

¹¹² Cf. however, Sébillot, *op. cit.*, I, 208-211; IV, 138.

¹¹³ Grimm, D. M., 4th ed., II, 899; Panzer, *Beiträge zur deutsch. Myth.*, II, 112; Zingerle, *Zwei Hexenprozesse*, 52, 54. Cf. the punishment of being boiled in a caldron; Child, *Ballads*, II, 321, n.; 327; V. 53; 230, 281; Gonzenbach, *Sicilianische Märchen*, I, 327; Cosquin, *Contes populaires de Lorraine*, I, 189. However, can we not call the belief forgotten when we find in newspapers of recent date an account of how the Camorrist priest, Vitozzi "who had been confined in the Florence Penitentiary, kissed the ground when he was discharged, and loudly proclaimed his innocence" (*New York Times*, May 1, 1913, in a telegram from Rome, dated April 30)?

MISCELLANEOUS

ROMANIC *aduolare*

In the *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, XXXVI, 88, W. Kaspers tries to show that French *aller* comes from *aduolare*, with *ll* < *dl* < *dvl*. This theory ov the sorce ov *aller* seems reazonabl, but the account ov its development iz faulty. A French consonant-groop recwires the retencion ov a following vowel, hwen the last consonant iz more sonorus than the wone before it. Hence if thær had existed such a form az **advolar*, it probably wood not hav lost the weak vowel. Even if we assume **advolar* or **advolar*, with fricativs ov nearly ewal sonority, the loss ov the vowel wood be rather unlikely: *m* and *n* hav practicaly the same sonority, yet French *mn* recwires a following vowel, az in *omme* < *omne* < *homine*, *somme* < *somne* < *somnu*. The werd *veuf* does not contradict this principl, for it iz not realy derived from **vedvo*; it iz a recent formacion, based on the analogj ov *neuf* beside *neuve*.¹ But supposing that the derivativ ov *aduolare* miht hav lost *o* in French, another dificulty remains. The Latin sound-groop *dw* makes French *v*: *venir* < *aduenire*, *avis* < *ad uisu*, *avoez* < *aduocatus*, *veve* < *uidua*. Thus *aduolare* wood giv **avoler* or **avler* az a normal development in erly French. This fact makes the assumed formacion ov **advler* impossibl.

We can, however, explain *aller* az a derivativ ov *aduolare*. Interjeccions, and other werds so uzed, often undergo chanjes that ar unknown in ordinary speech. Exampls to be found in spoken Inglish ar *kyu* or *kyo* for *thánk you*, *kout* for *look óut*, *mere* for *come hére*. The ferst ov thees iz especiaiy remarkabl, since it has lost the strest porcion, producing hwot iz otherwize hardly possibl in Inglish: a stressless isolated silabl. We can thærfore assume that *aduolate* and *aduolemus* miht hav become **adulate*, **adulemus*, or **adolate*, **adolemus*, by assimilacion ov the sounds *w* and *o*, at a time hwen the inical sound ov *uolo* woz like our *w*. Thees forms,

¹ Nyrop, *Gram. hist. de la langue française*, II, 262, Copenhague 1903.

corresponding to erly French **adlez*, **adlons*, wood hav developt an infinitiv **adler*, hwence later *aller* in accordance with *espalle* < *espadle*. The loss ov *w*, in the derivativ ov *aduolate*, has some fairly clös paralels in classic Latin, such az *deorsus* < **deuorsos*, *malo* = *mauolo*, *nosse* = *nouisse*, *somnus* < **suepnos*, *soror* < **suesor*; compare also Spanish *coso* < *consuo*. Or for the loss ov *o*, after a semivouel, compare *minus* < **minuos*, *secundus* < **se-quondos*,² and Italian *Firenze* < *Fiorenze* < *Florentiae*.

The stem derived from that ov *aduolate* and *aduolemus*, with a simpl vowel insted ov *uo*, wood contract to **adl-* in later Romanic speech. By assimilacion **adlemos* cood eaizly become **adnemos*: compare Rumanian *cunună* < *corona*, *funigine* < *fuligine*, *seamă* < *similo*; Sicilian *addiminari* < *addiuinare*, *minnitta* < *uindicta*; Italian *centinare* < *cincturare*, *gnene* = *gliene* < *illi inde*, *mungere* < *mulgere*, *vermena* < *uerbena*; French *concombe* < *cucumere*; Spanish *encina* = Port. *enzinha* < **ilicina*, *muermo* = Port. *mormo* < *morbu*, *mimbre* < *vimbre* < *uimen*. The form **adnemos* cood develop in two ways: to **annemos* in accord with Latin *flamma* < **flagma*, *scamnum* < **scabnom*, *somnus* < **suepnos*, Span. *cañado* < **cadnado* < *catenatu*, Ital. *spalla* < *spatula*; and to *andemos*, parallel with Span. *candado* < **cadnado*, *riendas* < **retinas*, *serondo* < *serotinu*, *espalda* < *spatula*, Port. *rendas* (= *rédeas*) < **retinas*, *espalda* < *spatula*, French *espalde*³ < *espadle* < *spatula*, Italian *spalto* < **spatulu*. Thus we reach the stems reprezented by Prov. *annar*, Ital. *andare*, Span. *andar*, Port. *andar*. The older form ov Catalan *anar* may hav been eether **adnar* or **andar*; compare *prenia* < *prehendeba*, *estona* = Jerman *stunde*. The stem ov dialectal Rumanian *imnă* miht be explaind by **amn . . .* < **avn . . .* < **avlemos* < **avolemos*, with normal *v* < *dw*. Rumanian iz fond ov the sound-groop *mn*: *domn* < *dominu*, *lemn* < *lignu*, *pumn* < *pugnu*, *somn* < *somnu*.

E. H. TUTTLE.

NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT.

² Stoltz-Schmalz, *Latinische Grammatik*, 54, München 1910.

³ *Romania*, XXXV, 104.

THE RECORD OF A VISIT TO J. C. SCALIGER

THE glamor and the incense which hang about literary reputations were perhaps never brighter nor more fragrant than in the sixteenth century. Let a man attract the eyes of literary Europe, let him speak with authority on things of the mind and, whether or not his life were eased by the gifts of the great, it was certain to be sweetened by the adulation of admiring young literati. An interesting example of this attitude is given in the brief account left by a young humanist, Hubert Sussanneau, of a journey which he made to Agen for the sake of looking upon J. C. Scaliger.

At the time, Scaliger had not yet mounted that Dictator's Chair which he occupied during the latter years of his life; his output in fact had been, so far, inconsiderable,—two or three volumes of Latin verses¹ and one polemical pamphlet. But that vindictive pamphlet was the *Oratio pro Cicerone contra Erasmus*² which, despite Erasmus's contemptuous silence, had drawn attention from every side to the middle-aged physician of the Bishop of Agen and had made him enemies and friends by the score. The prestige of the pamphlet had been lessened, it may be, by the publication of Dolet's *Dialogus*,³ of the same purport, in 1535. Scaliger, in fact, felt angrily that it had; and he had prepared a second reply, even more vigorous than its predecessor, fondly intended for the dispatch of Dolet's pretensions no less than of those of Erasmus. This work he had now sent to Paris for publication, despoiled however of the shafts aimed at Dolet,⁴ and its existence had been so well bruited abroad that Erasmus supposed it already in print when it

¹ *Novor. Epigrammatum liber unicus. Ejusdem hymni duo. Ejusd. diva Ludovica Sabaudia.* Paris, Vascosan, 1538.

Lacrimae (in obitum ducis a Longavilla). Paris, Vascosan, 1534.

Nemesis una cum duobus hymnis. Paris, Vascosan, 1535.

? *Manes Catulliani*, s. l. n. d.?

² Paris, P. Vidoue, 1531.

³ *Dialogus de Imitatione Ciceroniana adversus Desiderium Erasmus Roteradamum pro Christophoro Longolio.* Lyons, Gryphe, 1535.

⁴ For these details, cf. R. C. Christie, *Etienne Dolet* (2nd edition 1899), pp. 201-203.

had in fact not yet found a publisher.⁵ This oration, Sussanneau, himself a warm friend and admirer of Dolet, had got sight of in manuscript through Charles Sevin, a common friend of his own and of Scaliger's,⁶ in the beginning of the year in which he made his journey. But he shall give his own account of his admiration for it, and of his visit to its author, as he described them in a letter to his friend, Hubert de Pradine, "Huberto Pradinaeo meo," dated from Bordeaux on the fifth of June.⁷

"On the 13th of January, when I was at Paris, I read, by the advice of Charles Sevin, Julius Scaliger's second oration against Erasmus. As I read, it delighted me by both its elegance and its truth: by its elegance, for it preserved not only the sap and vigour but even the style and turn of Cicero;⁸ by its truth, because I had gathered from the affair itself and heard from various men of weight who told it, the same thing. And so I began to urge the man⁹ to print it soon, that it might more completely appear what eloquence there was in that illustrious man.¹⁰

Shortly afterwards I left Paris and arrived at Avignon, at which place having tarried barely fifteen days I already began to turn my thoughts towards Aquitaine. As skirmishes were threatening, I bestirred myself to get to Narbonne. When I there ran into a state of things no whit more settled I quickly betook myself to Toulouse. Though I was unwilling to stick in that City, de Pins the Bishop, de Minut the [first] President [of the *Parlement*], Boysonné the professor of law and Vulteius the poet¹¹ paid me distinguished attention. Burning with eagerness to see Bordeaux, the native place of the famous Ausonius, and most desirous of beholding Scaliger whose works I had seen in Paris, I arrived at Agen after a prosperous journey. O happy arrival! O lovely journey! How much noble talk on eloquence did I not hear from Scaliger? With what becoming counsels did he not plan for me the selection of a suitable kind of life!¹² With what a charm of his own he detained me!

⁵ Cf. a letter dated March 11th, 1536, cit. Bayle Art: *Erasme*, note L & (96).

⁶ One of the correspondents of J. C. Scaliger.

⁷ *Cit. partim. latine*, Bayle, art. *Erasme*, note L.

⁸ Non omnem modo succam ac sanguinem, sed etiam colorem & speciem. It is interesting to note how closely the XVI Century Ciceronian stuck to his model: Cf. Cic., *Att.* 4, 16, 10, "amisimus omnem non modo sucum et sanguinem, sed etiam colorem et speciem pristinam civitatis."

⁹ Sevin?

¹⁰ Quantum in illo heroë esset eloquentiae. Cf., again, Cic., *Att.* 4, 35, "quantum in illo heroe esset aimi."

¹¹ J. Faciot, thus generally referred to.

¹² "Quibus ille me consiliis ad eligendum genus vitae idoneis instruxit."

While this kindest of men was showing me his wonderful library of books, I browsed in it to an extraordinary extent. When he briefly opened to me how accurately he worked out medical science, I immensely enjoyed his gracious charm. May I die if I ever before took sincerer pleasure [in anything]!

In the course of conversation he questioned me about his second oration against Erasmus. I had read it, I said, but in manuscript. He thereupon, somewhat angered, said: O our friends! If friends [in fact] exist anywhere! It ought to have been published a long time ago; the little work was sent several months ago to Paris for this purpose, and news is rarely brought me here because of the long and unsafe journey. Therefore, Sussanneau, I beg you by the Muses and beseech you even with many prayers; if there is anyone at Paris who will attend to commissions of yours, forward by your recommendation the expedition of its publication."

Thereupon Sussanneau undertook to do this through de Pradine, relying upon a promise, given at their parting, that the latter would be to him in all things and on all occasions a second self. And this is the occasion of his letter to him, as he tells him:

"And so, my Hubert,—he continues,—Hubert writes to you so that you may see that your part is to secure that the brilliant body [of the book] be stained by no shameful blemish, and to bring all diligence to bear that it may be published as faultlessly as possible. Further, to arrange the business no one seems more suitable than P. Vidoue. This I wish you would consider among the most important and necessary matters. Farewell. Bordeaux, June the fifth."

And de Pradine did his share, for Scaliger's oration was duly published by Vidoue with Sussanneau's letter to de Pradine as a preface:

*Iulii Caesaris Scali/geri adversus Des. Erasmi/ Roteroda.
Dialogum Ciceronianum/ Oratio secunda./ . . . apud P. Vidouaeum.
MDXXXVII.¹³*

It will be remarked that no date has thus far been assigned to the pilgrimage of Sussanneau to Agen, and indeed it is difficult

¹³ Bib. Nat. inv. X 17729.

Bayle notes that the rarity of the second oration may be due to destruction of the edition by friends of Erasmus, perhaps by his request before he died, since it could naturally not have been destroyed by Erasmus' own agents, as Joseph Scaliger asserts. (*Scaligerana, Erasme* (ed. Amst. MDCCXL, p. 311)) Bayle art. *Erasme*, note L.

to assign one for the following reasons: Like de la Monnoie,¹⁴ the *Biographie Universelle* and other authorities, R. C. Christie asserts that the book was actually published in December, 1536, though dated 1537 "in accordance with the vicious practice early introduced amongst publishers and not yet obsolete."¹⁵ He gives no grounds for this, but his unsurpassed accuracy makes it probable that he had other reasons besides the obvious one which gives this position a formidable air of strength. For Erasmus died in July 1536 and not only would the publication of the oration have been idle, as well as more ungenerous than even Scaliger would like to appear, if published so long as eleven months, or a year, after that event, but it appears at first blush improbable that Sussanneau would have spoken in the terms he did of the "truth" of the Oration and of his delight in it, if the object of its attack had been dead six months at the time he read it. And yet there are considerations drawn from the life of Sussanneau which make it probable that such was indeed the case.

In 1536 Sussanneau published his *Dictionarium Ciceronianum*, which, the first of its kind,¹⁶ has somewhat the air of deliberately braving the ridicule which Erasmus had attached to the idea of such a work by his fancy of the Ciceronian lexicon of Nosoponus. In the dedication of this work to the celebrated Bishop of Coutances, Philippe de Cossé, dated from Paris the first of March, Sussanneau speaks of a journey to Italy begun in October,¹⁷ which had involved a year's interruption of lectures now resumed. On the way to Italy, he had stopped in Lyons and had done some editorial or correcting work for Sebastian Gryphe.¹⁸ There he encountered Dolet, at that time connected with Gryphe and occupied with the composition of his *Commentaria Linguae Latinae*,¹⁹ and was so

¹⁴ *Cit. Bayle, art. Erasme*, note L.

¹⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 203, n.

¹⁶ The nearest thing to it was:

Apparatus latinae locutionis ex M. T. Cicerone, Caesare, Sallustio, Terentio, Plauto, ad Herennium, Asconio, Celsio, ac de re Rustica, Per Bartholomeacum Riccius Lugensem in/ summum ordinem/ descriptus. Pars Prima. . . . Venice, M.D. XXXIII. B. N. inv. X 226.

¹⁷ Sub festum divi Remigii. *Dic. Cic.* fol. 2 r^o.

¹⁸ I. e. Superintendance of the correction of some works of Cic. Hor. & Cyprian, *ibid.*

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, and *cf.* R. C. Christie, *op. cit.*, p. 236.

immensely struck by Dolet's ability and learning as to ask his counsel relative to his own composition. Now Dolet, who had first gone to Lyons in August 1534, had left it at the end of that year for a visit to Paris and returned early in 1535, the date at which his meeting with Sussanneau²⁰ is placed by R. C. Christie, his biographer.

If this conjecture is correct and Sussanneau returned to Paris in the autumn of 1535, it is very singular that, in giving a detailed account of his Italian journey in the dedication of the *Dictionarium Ciceronianum* of March 1536, he should not mention that he had again, as he tells de Pradine in his edition of Scaliger, left Paris shortly after the 13th of January, and been to Avignon, Narbonne, Toulouse, and Agen; and it is equally singular that, three months later than his Paris letter to Cossé, he should be writing an account of this journey to de Pradine dated not from Paris but from Bordeaux; for from this we should have to suppose that he had returned from Italy in the autumn of 1535 and resumed his lectures, left it for a journey in January, been in Paris again in March and written of the resumption of his work as if it had not since been interrupted, and been in Bordeaux in June writing about a journey in that neighborhood which had been begun shortly after January. This looks unlikely enough, but, besides this, the Municipal Archives of Grenoble show that on the 28th of April 1536 Sussanneau was appointed to a mastership in the municipal school there, presented by the principal *de facto* Guiges Didier, by whom he had apparently been fetched straight from Paris, "quem a civitate Parisiense huc conduxit."²¹ He was certainly in Grenoble on May 4th, when the

²⁰ *Ibid.* It is certainly highly improbable that it took place at the only other admissible time, *i. e.*, after Dolet's arrival at Lyons in August 1534, for in 1534 after visiting Lyons Sussanneau made a journey to Italy, including a considerable sojourn at Turin, where he lectured and had time to make numerous friends. He stopped on his way home for a while at Dijon and seems to have been back again in Paris after not more than the year's absence. And again, even if we were to accept this hypothesis and suppose Sussanneau to have begun his journey in October 1533 and concluded it in October 1534, writing his dedication in March 1535, we should have to suppose that the *Dictionarium Ciceronianum*, no less than the *Oratio* of Scaliger, was published a year earlier than its date, in 1535 *i. e.* though dated 1536. In view of these difficulties everything points to the correctness of R. C. Christie's conjecture as to the date of the meeting of Dolet and Sussanneau.

²¹ *Archives municipales*, Grenoble, April 28th, 1536. Reg. BB 77, fol. 62 v°.

consuls were debating the refusal of the Dean's vicar to install him,²² and on the following day, when an agreement was made between him, Didier, and another incumbent.²³ His post, we are told, was vacated by August 4th because he had been guilty of disorderly conduct, and had fled from Grenoble shortly before that date,²⁴ but we must suppose him in the interval performing the duties of his office, and these would certainly be inconsistent with a journey to Bordeaux within a month of his appointment.

All this indicates that the journey to Agen must have taken place, the letter to de Pradine have been written, and Scaliger's second oration have been published, in 1537,²⁵ the date which the latter bears on its title page. And it may be noted moreover that, in his letter to de Pradine dated June 5th, Sussanneau speaks of impending troubles—"impendentibus bellis"—at Avignon and even at Narbonne, whereas not only did the Emperor's troops not enter Provence until towards the end of July 1536, but, though there were earlier rumours of the Emperor's intentions, Francis I only held his deliberative council on plans of defense in the middle of May and despatched his captains southward at the end of that month,²⁶ and it is natural to conclude that Sussanneau was arrived in Avignon by the middle of May if not earlier. In 1537, on the other hand, the war was being conducted in Piedmont by de Humières, who was given his commission on the 8th of March, and by May reinforcements were marching thither from Artois by way of Lyons,²⁷ quite near enough to cause rumours of war in Avignon. But to assign the date of 1537 to Sussanneau's letter and to the publication of the *Oratio* still leaves us to reckon with the more than ungenerous

²² *Ibid.* fol. 63 r°.

²³ *Ibid.* fol. 64 v°.

²⁴ Quia dominus Ymbertus Suzaneus his novissimis diebus ad certas viencias in hujus modi civitate processit propter quas ab eadem confugit. . . . *Ibid.* fol. 90.

²⁵ The date of 1535 would, of course, be more definitely out of the question than 1536, since the letter of Erasmus to Marvolius and Laurentius, which occasioned Scaliger's second oration, was not written until March, nor reached Scaliger until April 1535. R. C. Christie, *op. cit.*, p. 202-203. La Monnoie says it reached Scaliger on September 12th *cit.* Bayle art. *Erasme*, note L.

²⁶ Cf. DuBellay, *Mémoires*, Soc. de l'Hist. de France, III, pp. 31 & 40.

²⁷ Cf. *ibid.* pp. 396 & 404.

treatment by Scaliger of a dead adversary²⁸ to whose memory we know he wished at least to appear to make amends,²⁹ and with scarcely less ungenerous behaviour on the part of the author of the *Dictionarium Ciceronianum*.

On the other hand in a letter to Omphalius, dated May 4th 1536,³⁰ Scaliger expresses, at length and with emphasis, his willingness and indeed his lively desire to be reconciled with Erasmus. While he may have done this to please Omphalius, immensely flattered as he was by a visit from him, yet he need not have expressed himself so warmly on the subject had he not meant what he said. After some extreme compliments to Omphalius, Scaliger proceeds:

"Therefore my Omphalius, since such is the extent of your kindness to me, you shall easily gain from me a favour which, on account of your innumerable excellences, you should spontaneously have received from me. Accept the freedom of my affection which you shall pass on to Erasmus. I intrust it (my affection) to your care, so that out of it you may promise to whom you will that all is quieted, pacified, tranquil, affable, in fine, and even affectionate (pia). I yield this to your kindness, to my own mildness, to the splendor of his name, to his esteemed learning, to his benefits towards the Republic of letters, to which he devoted his leisure and did not hesitate in the least to exchange his ease for the ease of the Republic. By this good nature let him indeed perceive that I stood aloof from him just to the extent that he seemed about to fail his defence of eloquence. I have, Omphalius, the same feeling for my candor that I had for my defence of Cicero, with as much justifica-

²⁸ Cf. the verses to Erasmus deceased, in the *Heroes*, *Des. Erasmo Roterdamo* beginning

"Tu ne etiam moreris? an quid me linquis Erasme
Ante, meus quam sit conciliatus amor?

Poemata omnia, in *Bibliopolio Commeliniano*, MDCXXI, p. 301. And cf. *Scaligerana*, art. *Erasme* (Amst. MDCCXL, p. 311 & 312). "Poenituit patrem adversus illum scripsisse . . . cum postea pater vidit reliqua Erasmi opera, vidit se errasse quod contra illum scripsisset."

²⁹ Jacob Omphalius of Andernach, professor at Cologne, author of several latin works, among them a commentary in *ciceronis orat. 3*. He died in 1570 (Jocher).

³⁰ *Jacobo Omphalio. Jul. Caes. Scaligeri Epistolae & orationes*. Hanover, MDCXII, p. 275. (MCVII) ("Elle est la XVII^e dans l'ed. de Toulouse." Bayle, *loc. cit.*, note 83 (edpst. aliquot . . . acc. . . . opuscula et Fragmenta praf. in Aristot. hist. de animalibus. Toulouse, 1620?)).

tion and even more. And so I promise that all my counsels, all my strength, advantages, constancy, dignity, spirit and my very self shall be in your loyal charge and in your power.

But I beg you, Omphalius, who show me that so much good and peace awaits me in the Republic [of letters], look to it that, what I do by reason of your kindness and my own, I may not seem to have done through a kind of fear. For your evidence is very telling and weighty.

I shall consider it enough to have laid aside, on the heart of the most eloquent of men, a quarrel with an eloquent man undertaken in behalf of eloquence; especially since Erasmus himself has now at last taken off that mask fatal to eloquence and has repudiated his former view; wherefore you will see that the popular supporters of his way of thinking are fallen in spirit.

.....

Indeed I always admired him as a man endowed with literary merits numerous and great; I revered his labours, vigils, works. For this very reason I took it extremely ill that the principles of eloquence should be perverted by one whom I had really set up as a guide for myself when I was young, and in my old age had proposed to set up as such for my children. . . . I, indeed, am supported by a clear and open conscience, in that I did what in a manner ought to have been done by Erasmus for himself, a thing which, in fact, partly undertaken by me, he at length accomplished so as to be reconciled with Cicero. For he bears witness to this in a recent letter affixed to the *Tusculanae quaestiones*. Therefore I consider that I have a sufficient share of praise and glory, not in that I routed so great a general but in that he followed my opinion.

And so, when with sudden good sense he either did away with or changed that proscription of the flowers of eloquence³¹ so disastrous to the Republic [of letters], he brought consolation to my good name, which was being impudently attacked by the outcries of light and shameless sciolists. . . . One thing remains, my Omphalius, that, our dissensions set aside³² and laid in the very lap of courteous good sense, we should, as a result of your persuasion and exhortation to our reconciliation, put an end to our quarrel,—a quarrel which, undertaken from the very zeal of literature, may indeed easily defile its purity and reserve. Nor has that anger any bounds to which we are very easily moved when caught in our mistakes, and it grows by the daily incitement of party cries. . . . as for him, what his disposition towards me may be I neither know

³¹ Eloquentium proscriptionem.

³² I. e., his own & Erasmus'.

nor am able to guess; except that I certainly think him to be hostile in the extreme. If this matter fans previous disagreements I easily yield. For nothing could befall me more glorious than to have kept back his attack from the Republic [of letters], nor anything more advantageous than, when he had become my enemy on account of it, to have surpassed him in good-will. Farewell. May 4th, Agen, 1536."

In spite of its irritating touches of pompous magnanimity, this letter certainly indicates, on the whole, a serious desire to make peace with Erasmus. Scaliger's interview with Sussanneau must, if it took place in 1536, have occurred either shortly before or immediately after he penned this letter. In the latter case Scaliger would be doing an almost incredible thing in urging Sussanneau to publish the second oration, and even in the former case it remains extremely unlikely that, after thus expressing himself, he should allow Sussanneau, who must have been still within easy reach, to proceed to carry out his injunctions.

Is it not in fact easier to believe that, a year after Erasmus's death, Scaliger, regretting the sacrifice of a cherished book, pushed its publication, hoping that if it were published it might appear, at worst, to have been allowed to see the light as a mere exercise in Ciceronianism whose merits the author was unwilling to consign to obscurity, though its occasion was past; or, at best, to have got beyond its author's control before he was aware of Erasmus's death^{32a} and to have been issued without his sanction? The latter plan, it is true, would be rendered abortive by Sussanneau's frank letter, unless (which is hardly credible) they both felt they could still pretend to be ignorant of Erasmus's death as late as the summer of 1537.

Sussanneau's visit to Scaliger may shed some light upon yet another small point. Christie points out³³ that Dolet lost the friendship of Sussanneau about 1537 or 1538. In 1536 Sussanneau, as we have seen, had spoken of Dolet with enthusiastic admiration, whereas in the *Ludi* of 1538 there are three epigrams *In Medium* which, as Christie shows, were clearly directed against his former

^{32a} Scaliger's own dedicatory letter to Pierre de Rubri is dated the 25th of October, 1535.

³³ *Op. cit.*, p. 317.

friend.³⁴ It is not even necessary to suppose, as does his biographer, that Dolet had sacrificed the friendship of Sussanneau by the defects of his own disposition. It is enough to assume that the latter's esteem for Dolet was not strong enough, after the lapse of a year, to withstand the attacks of Scaliger's vindictive fury, once Sussanneau had lost his heart to the physician of Agen. And, though of no weight as evidence, the fact that Sussanneau's change of front towards Dolet showed itself first in 1538 may strengthen the circumstantial evidence which goes to indicate that Sussanneau's visit to Agen, and hence, the publication of the *'Adversus Des. Erasmi . . . Dialogum Ciceronianum Oratio Secunda'*, took place in 1537.

CAROLINE RUUTZ-REES.

GREENWICH, CONN.

³⁴ *Ibid.*

REVIEWS

The Fairy-Faith in Celtic Countries by W. Y. EVANS WENTZ. Henry Frowde, Oxford University Press, 1911. 8vo. Pp. xxviii, 524.

This is a most curious book. An earlier form of it appeared in 1909, as a dissertation offered for the degree of Docteur ès Lettres of the University of Rennes, which has been rewritten, enlarged in scope, and supplemented with new materials. The thesis maintained is nothing less than the actual existence of fairies, which the author thinks he has scientifically shown, by what he calls his psychological theory, to rest "upon a logical and solid foundation" (515). To follow his arguments, step by step, through a maze of details taken from the diverse fields of folk-lore, archaeology, anthropology, medieval Celtic and French literatures, comparative religion, psychopathic psychology, and telepathy, is a more difficult task than to refute them.

Dr. Wentz in writing a large book on Celtic traditions has followed in the path of a certain school of English and American writers, who talk much about Celtic influences, without being acquainted with any of the Celtic languages. For this reason the evidence that he presents, taken from "living Celts who either believe in fairies, or else say that they have seen fairies," is less authoritative than what he would have found in the books he disdains to use, such as Curtin's *Tales of the Fairies*, and J. G. Campbell's *Superstitions of the Scottish Highlands*, and *Witchcraft and Second Sight in the Scottish Highlands*. However, it is the first part of the book (1-282), in which the author has put the results of his inquiries, gained chiefly through interpreters, that has some original value in the confirmatory evidence it presents for some phases of popular belief.

Dr. Wentz has very little to say about witchcraft (261-4) and seems not to be at all acquainted with the literature of the subject. This is unfortunate, because if he had read the works of such learned witchmongers as Rémy, Bodin and de Lancre, they would have supplied him with information, which matches and supplements his own, on the part played by daemons, familiar spirits, and magical operations from classical times. The evidence, oral and printed, that both he and they present to prove their respective theses, is often identical, and is just as good in one case as in the other, however different may have been the aim of their arguments. Dr. Wentz is as credulous in taking seriously the statements of uncultured people, who rose to the occasion in answering his suggestive questions, as his bloodthirsty predecessors in the animistic world were in believing their rack-tortured victims, who were ready to confess anything suggested to them. In the course of the book there are astonishing instances of a lack of critical literary judgment, and surprising lapses of information. The author cites Malory's *Morte Darthur* as equally authoritative for Celtic beliefs as the Welsh triads (310ff.); Foerster's edition of the *Conte de la Charrete* is unknown to him (311) and he cites as a popular tale the well known story, adopted from Nennius by Geoffrey of Monmouth, of the prophecies of the fatherless boy, Merlin (436-7). Still the book deserves a place in any folk-

lore collection, both for the first-hand information it contains, and because it is itself a curious product of folk-literature.

GEORGE L. HAMILTON.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY.

(A) *La Española de Florencia* (ó *Burlas Veras, y Amor Invencionero*). Comedia Famosa de Don Pedro Calderón de la Barca. Edited, with an Introduction and Notes by S. L. MILLARD ROSENBERG. Publications of the University of Pennsylvania, Series in Romanic Languages and Literatures, No. 5. Philadelphia, 1911.

(B) *Las Burlas Veras*. Comedia Famosa de Lope de Vega Carpio. Edited with an Introduction and Notes by S. L. Millard Rosenberg, Ph.D. Publications of the University of Pennsylvania, Department of Romanic Languages and Literatures. Extra Series, No. 2. Philadelphia, 1912.

Dr. Rosenberg merits the thanks of every *aficionado* of the Spanish drama not only for having furnished an authoritative text of these entertaining *comedias*, but for having definitely settled a long existent controversy about their authorship.

(A) His text of *La Española de Florencia* is based upon that appearing in the twelfth part of *Comedias Nuevas Escogidas* (Madrid, 1658), and only when unavoidable have emendations been suggested or variants introduced from the undated Leefdael and Padrino *suetas*.

After having given a detailed account of these editions, as well as the second and third impressions of *Comedias Nuevas Escogidas* (all of great rarity), Dr. Rosenberg takes up the long mooted question of authorship. He states that in all extant prints of *La Española de Florencia* Calderón appears as author; and rightly, since the play is written in his typical manner. Unfortunately, Calderón himself included it among forty of his supposititious *comedias*, and omitted it from a list of genuine works he drew up in 1680. This led his biographer, Vera Tassis, to consider it as spurious. Dr. Rosenberg shows, however, that Calderón omitted several of his genuine plays from the 1680 list; that he took little interest in his secular pieces; and that the above mentioned table of spurious *comedias* is not entirely trustworthy. When pirated editions of his plays appeared, it seems that Calderón disowned some of these mutilated pieces, and the editor believes this to be the case with *La Española de Florencia*. Even the text in the *Comedias Escogidas* shows that many unauthorized changes have doubtless crept into the original. But, for all, the Calderonian stamp still remains, as Dr. Rosenberg amply demonstrates. Moreover, from strong internal evidence he concludes that the *comedia* figures among the author's early works, and was written while he was still under Tirso's influence—probably about 1630.

La Española de Florencia has often been attributed to Lope de Vega, continues the editor, and Barrera went so far as to suggest that it might be identical with his *Las Burlas de Amor*, mentioned in the list of his *comedias* in the *Prólogo* to the *Peregrino*. This view was shared by Stiebel, who, besides supposing the two plays to be identical with another of Lope's, *Las Burlas Veras*, believed that internal evidence in *La Española de Florencia* proved Lope's authorship. Evidently, neither he nor Barrera had *Las Burlas Veras* at their disposal for comparison. And little wonder, since so rare is it that Dr. Rosenberg was able

to locate only one copy, a *suelta*, in the British Museum. A comparison of this with *La Española de Florencia* shows them to be widely dissimilar, both in subject and in style.

The confusion that has existed between the three above mentioned *comedias* has been increased by two other plays of similar title. One, *Las Burlas Veras*, is by Julian de Armendarez, found in manuscript in the R. Biblioteca Palatina at Parma; the other, an anonymous piece entitled *Burlas Veras, y Enredos de Benito*. Restori states that the manuscript at Parma was either a copy of one of Lope's plays, or the only original *comedia* of Armendarez that has survived. It is evident that he had not seen Lope's *Las Burlas Veras*, for Armendarez's sole surviving piece has nothing in common either with it or with any of the other *Burlas Veras* versions. The anonymous *Burlas Veras, y Enredos de Benito* is likewise very dissimilar from Lope's *Las Burlas Veras* and *La Española de Florencia*. By whom it was written is much disputed. But there can be no reason for questioning the authenticity of the *suelta*, *Las Burlas Veras*, printed under Lope's name. That he is also the author, however, of *La Española de Florencia* cannot be admitted, whether on stylistic or other grounds. Dr. Rosenberg further states that to Stiefel is due the discovery of the chief source of *La Española de Florencia*, in an Italian comedy of the sixteenth century, *G'In-gannati*, whose plot was used many times in Italian, Spanish and Latin plays. Shakespeare's *Twelfth Night* came from a Latin adaptation of *G'In-gannati*, and not from *La Española de Florencia*, as has at times been supposed.

Having thus so definitely settled the long existent dispute about *La Española de Florencia*, the editor takes up the relations of *Las Burlas Veras* with *Burlas de Amor*. No copy of the latter has survived, and (so far as known) only a single *suelta* of *Burlas Veras*. Unfortunately it is without date, so we cannot tell whether or not it preceded the appearance of Lope's *Peregrino* (1604), in the *Prólogo* of which *Burlas de Amor* is cited. We have, then, two alternatives: either *Burlas Veras* was written after 1604, and *Burlas de Amor*, a different play, has been lost (like many another of Lope's); or Lope, in the *Prólogo*, deliberately changed the title *Burlas Veras* to *Burlas de Amor*. The latter supposition Dr. Rosenberg thinks more likely, since Lope may have wished to distinguish his *comedia* from contemporary pieces of like title, and especially from the *Burlas Veras* of Armendarez, his hated rival. A passage in a letter of Lope, dated 1604, tends to support such a theory; and numerous quotations by the editor from *Burlas Veras* show the title *Burlas de Amor* to be equally appropriate. A detailed plot of the *comedia*, a metrical scheme, and abundant notes add to the usefulness and interest of the edition.

(B) So interdependent are *Las Burlas Veras*, *La Española de Florencia* and the other *comedias* of similar title, that in the Introduction to his critical edition of *Las Burlas Veras* Dr. Rosenberg must necessarily discuss questions already treated in his *La Española de Florencia*. These same questions he has considered from different viewpoint, however—that of *Las Burlas Veras*.

After stating that both the interest and the rarity of the *comedia* seem to make a critical edition desirable, he recounts in detail the confusion that had so long existed between *Burlas Veras* and the three plays of similar title, mentioned in (A). The authenticity of *Burlas Veras* is then discussed, and abundant and conclusive reasons advanced to prove it to be of Lope.

Dr. Rosenberg has been unable to discover "any convincing source or

historic basis" for the action of the piece in any of the *crónicas* accessible to him. He deems the plot to be the pure invention of the author, and observes that three other plays of Lope offer the same situation as the main theme (a princely suitor disguised as secretary to a princess of whom he is enamored, and whom he finally weds). The entire list of *dramatis personae* is representative of Lope, but the *gracioso* is especially characteristic. A number of excerpts go to prove this.

It is impossible to determine exactly when *Burlas Veras* was written. The apparently single copy that has survived is undated, and names no publisher or place of publication. Further, the *comedia* itself contains no reference that would throw light on the question. Dr. Rosenberg makes plain, however, that the maturity of the style, as well as the appearance of the *gracioso*, preclude the piece from being one of Lope's youthful efforts. His two earliest plays in which a *gracioso* is found, were written, one about, the other in, the year 1599; therefore it is unlikely that *Burlas Veras* saw the light before that year. The editor suggests a date about 1602 or 1603.

After discussing the relations between *Burlas Veras* and *Burlas de Amor*, and suggesting that they are identical and that Lope deliberately changed the latter title to the former on account of his rival Armendarez, the editor tells all that is known of the enmity of the two authors. It is probable their rivalry dates from about 1603, but the cause thereof is obscure.

The excellently printed volume is embellished with three photographic fac-similes of the title pages of *La Española de Florencia*, the anonymous *Burlas Veras, y Enredos de Benito* and Armendarez's *Burlas Veras*. A metrical scheme is also added. So scholarly are both the editions reviewed, that it is to be hoped the promised appearance of Armendarez's *comedia* and the anonymous *Burlas* will not be long delayed.

GEORGE W. BACON.

WYNCOTE, PENNA.

Défense de la Poésie Française à l'Usage des Lecteurs Anglais. Par EMILE LECOIS, Professeur de Langue et Littérature Anglaises à la Sorbonne. Paris, Hachette; London, Constable & Co., 1912. Pp. vi, 151.

The volume of Professor Legouis, who visited this country last year, is composed of four lectures delivered at the University of London and repeated by request at Oxford. These pages are of charming tact and delicacy, and their modesty is only surpast by their urbanity. The occasion—a defense of French poetry against the usual censure of English criticism—requird in the lecturer a constant balance of rare qualities.

M. Legouis finds that English opinion hostil to French poetry dates from Dryden's severe, yet seemingly flattering statement: "Impartially speaking, the French are as much better critics than the English, as they are worse poets." He passes to the specious condemnation by Coleridge, as seen in his deadly arrangement of national qualities in pairs: "reason and understanding,—imagination and fancy,—humor and wit": the golden terms of these pairs Coleridge gave to the English or the Germans, the silver terms (understanding, fancy, wit), to their Gallic neibors. He follows this with an illuminating discussion of the systematic, violent criticism of such men as Carlyle, De Quincey and Landor.

M. Legouis then considers Matthew Arnold's condemnation of Hugo and other French poets, his laudation of lyrics by Shakespeare and Heine (p. 16 ss.). No part of the book is more brilliant than this in which the author smilingly refutes the sofism of Arnold. M. Legouis offers intentionally only a choice from among English detractors of French poetry, and his choice is fairly and intelligently made. He could have cited scores of other critics, but refrains because of the lack of space. In a longer treatise, he would probably have cited two well-known lines in which Pope appears to admit that, thanks to the genius of Corneille and Racine, France has something to admire, and perhaps John Wesley's strident vituperations against the French language, which close: "It is as impossible to write a fine poem in French as to make fine music from a jewsharp." If he had descended as far as Mr. George Saintsbury, he would have found a man skilful in ringing all the changes on the criticism of Dryden, as when he says (*Miscellaneous Essays*, p. 322): "Thus the French have never produced any man with that combination of sense of the vague, of imagination, and of humor which goes to make the highest poetry; and I am not sure that we have ever produced any one with that mixture of sobriety, inventiveness, precision, wit, and critical spirit which goes to make the highest and most perfect prose." In passing, one may be pardoned for noting how admirably Mr. Saintsbury's statement is manufactured strictly for the local market! The same critic says somewhere else that the average Briton is convinced in his heart of hearts that French poetry is something very like a contradiction of terms, and that the history of poetry in France is as the history of the Icelandic Owl. M. Legouis intentionally neglected another source of testimony as to English contempt for French poetry: English poets and prose writers have occasionally uttered more or less rapsodical lists of "sweet poets" whom they adore. Mrs. Browning, for example, in her *Vision of Poets* mentions about thirty-four such poets, only two of whom are French,—Corneille and Racine (fourteen English poets, I believe, appear in this list!). Again, one will scan in vain Sydney Lanier's *The Crystal* in search of a French poet, and Chopin, a semi-Frenchman only (whence perhaps this glory) is the only Gallic name in the number of poets, musicians and painters mentioned by Lanier in *Clover*.

In defining those English critics who have followed the false but "taking" formula of Coleridge, M. Legouis might have said with La Bruyère: "Où ils voient l'agréable, ils en excluent le solide; où ils croient découvrir les grâces du corps, l'agilité, la souplesse, la dextérité, ils ne veulent plus y admettre les dons de l'âme, la profondeur, la profusion, la sagesse."¹

The second chapter, *Scops et Trouvères*, offers a remarkable comparison between Old French and Anglo-Saxon poetry. The author very properly commences with a comparison of the material qualities of the two languages, and the skilled phonetician even will find in these pages a number of happy and successful characterizations. In reading the first twenty pages of this chapter, one

¹ Didactic solidity is a well-known trait of English non-dramatic verse. John Bunyan's lines in his *Author's Apology to Pilgrim's Progress* may be cited as typical:

Solidity indeed becomes the pen
Of him who writeth things divine to men.

shud compare the more voluminous discussion of Professor Walter Morris Hart, *Ballad and Epic* in the *Harvard Studies in Philology and Literature*. The author finds that the common-places—the "clichés"—of Anglo-Saxon poetry are scenes of fright and violence, of gloom and terror: "D'où une atmosphère grise, ténébreuse même, créée par la collaboration du langage avec le sentiment"; and, finally: "poésie puissante, monocorde et nocturne" (pp. 43, 44). Old French poetry appears to him bathed in sunlight: *clarité, lumière blanche*: "Le propre de la langue d'oil était en somme moins le coloris que la simple lueur, la lumière blanche, ou encore cette transparence de l'eau de roche ou d'une fontaine pure sur un lit de sable fin" (p. 46). He cites:

En un vergier lez une fontenelle
Dont clere est l'onde et blanche la gravele
Siet fille a roi, sa main a sa maxele:
En spirant son doux ami rapele . . .

The author quotes and discusses a number of characteristic passages from the Old French epic. He draws attention to the prevalent joy, hope, latent vigor, resilience, and says of the national heros: "On n'a jamais avec eux, comme avec les héros anglo-saxons, l'impression que le grand ressort de la vie, qui est l'amour de la vie, est brisé." He adds (p. 55): "Le jour et la joie entraînent dans la littérature anglaise avec le chant que Taillefer faisait retentir à Hastings." M. Legouis, after several pages of brilliant analysis, closes this section of his book with the most perfect criticism which has ever been written of the exquisit *Gaète et Oriour*.

In his third lecture, *Au Grand Siècle*, M. Legouis considers English criticism of the XVIIth century French poetry. The facts limit the discussion largely to dramatic poetry. The reader will find here a dispassionate yet firm and earnest defence of the French Alexandrin and of French dramatic verse. The argument against the alleged monotony of the Alexandrin is the most skilful and convincing to be found. Such comparisons as this are frequent: "L'alexandrin classique avec sa coupe médiane me fait plutôt penser, lui, à quelque grand oiseau planant, le corps faisant césure entre les deux ailes. Le vers anglais saisit la pensée dans ses replis, souvent avec une force de prise incomparable. Le vers français s'ouvre, s'étale, s'épanouit au-dessus d'elle" (p. 91). While the description of the English heroic line seems to me to err in not laying sufficient emphasis on its jerkiness and erratic violence—qualities certainly not artistic—that of the French line appears to me thoroughly adequate.¹ Students of English will read with closest interest M. Legouis' statement of the defects and limitations—due doubtless to prevailing taste—of the style of Shakespeare (pp. 95-114).

The fourth and last lecture, *De Nos Jours*, treats of a period entirely outside the scope of this *Review*. Lovers of literature, however, may be pleased to note that they will find here an enthusiastic yet merited laudation of the lamented Auguste Angellier, especially of his sonnets *A l'Amie Perdue* (Hachette). Of the three sonnets cited, two might with advantage for English readers have been

¹ English taste in meter is illuminatingly reflected in the language of a recent reviewer of Churchill: "His lines have something of the robustness and tempestuous disregard of regularity which lend strength to Dryden."

replaced by others. I say this with some hesitation, realizing the difficulty of making an absolute choice among the one hundred and eighty four exquisit sonnets of this, the rarest and most perfect garland of love sonnets ever woven! Let one sit down alone and read aloud the first sonnets in this collection. In a few moments, one will catch what appear to be accents from a profound, sincere and tragically sad voice,—which seems almost that of the dead poet as he must at times have read these verses in his bitter solitude.

M. Legouis has—perhaps thru discretion—neglected the moral consideration which is probably back of much English censure of things French. The English appear to have taxt always several of their neibors with immorality, and to have, little by little, fortified their conscience by creating a new standard of morality. One cud form a long series of English opinions like that of King Henry after Azincourt. He is reported to have said to Charles d'Orléans: "Car on dit que onques plus grand désordre de voluptés, de péchés et de mauvais vices ne fut vu, comme ceux qui règnent en France aujourd'hui. C'est pitié de l'ouir recoder et horreur aux écoutants. Et si Dieu en est courroucé, ce n'est pas merveille et nul ne s'en doit ébahir" (cited by Pierre Champion, *Vie de Charles d'Orléans*, p. 153, Paris, 1911). The French being, in the English mind, grossly immoral, it followed that their art and literature—especially their poetry, which is the crowning glory of literaure—must be lacking in the highest qualities. While one cannot apply rigorously such a general principle of interpretation as is here indicated, I am convinst that it will serve to explain in large measure English distaste for French poetry. Various other explanations of this fenomenon have of course appeard; see, for example: Brander Mathews, *International Quarterly*, VII (1903), pp. 25, 30; and Henry Van Dyke, *Scribner's*, XLIX (1911), p. 707.

R. W.

NOTES AND NEWS

The friends and former pupils of Emile Picot presented him with a memorial volume, entitled *Mélanges offerts à M. Emile Picot*, on the fifth of June.

On the 9th of June, a dinner was offered Professor G. L. Kittredge, to celebrate the completion of the twenty-fifth year of his service as a teacher at Harvard University. Professor C. H. Grandgent presided. More than one hundred friends and former pupils of Professor Kittredge sat down to dinner. The gift to the library of a fund of more than \$4,000 in honor of Professor Kittredge was announced, and he was presented with a memorial volume containing articles by forty five contributors. The volume is published by Ginn & Co.

Mr. C. H. Conrad Wright, of Harvard University, has been promoted to the chair of French language and literature.

Dr. Oliver M. Johnston, of the Leland Stanford Jr. University, has been promoted to the professorship of Romance languages.

Dr. J. P. Rice of Acadia University has accepted an assistant professorship in Romance languages at Williams College.

Professor Adolphe Terracher, of Johns Hopkins University, has accepted a call to the University of Liverpool.

Professor Stanley L. Galpin of Amherst College has been elected to the chiefship in Romance languages at Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.

Francisco Mez de Medinilla, Bárbara de Braganza, 12, 4°, offers to provide at reasonable price fotografis done in *blanc sur noir*, of manuscripts, documents and rare prints existing at Madrid.

The fourth volume of Professor Nyrop's monumental *Grammaire historique de la Langue Française* has appeared with the imprint of A. Picard et Fils, 82, rue Bonaparte, Paris.

Students of Arthurian literature will welcome the new volume of the *Gesellschaft für Romanische Literatur: Gunbaut, altfranzösischer Artusroman des 13 Jahrhunderts*. The text was copied by Wendelin Foerster from the unique MS. of Chantilly, and critically edited by the late Jakob Stürzinger, whose work was revised and added to by Dr. H. Breuer.

Adjunct Professor Frederick Curry Ostrander of the University of Texas died at New York on March 24, after a painful illness, endured with fortitude. Professor Ostrander was born at Kingston, N. Y., in 1871, and graduated from Wesleyan University in 1893. He went to Europe in 1895, and studied at Leipzig, Berlin and Geneva, remaining two years. From 1902 to 1903 he was Fellow in Romance languages at Columbia University, and for the following year served as Columbia's International Fellow at Paris. From 1904 to 1905, he was lecturer in Romance languages at Columbia, and then taught for two years at Western Reserve University. He was connected with the University of Texas from 1907 until his fatal illness. He took his Ph.D. at Columbia in June, 1911. It is expected that his dissertation, an edition of the Old French poem, *Roman dou Lis*, will soon be published.

